3

REPORT RESUMES

ED 002 807 24
A SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SCHOOL VANDALISM.
BY- GOLDMAN, NATHAN
SYRACUSE UNIV., N.Y., RESEARCH INSTITUTE
REPORT NUMBER CRP-181 PUB DATE 31 JUL 59
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-18(6453)
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$6.68 167P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL VANDALISM, SOCIALLY DEVIANT BEHAVIOR, *DELINQUENCY, SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED, *SOCIAL VALUES, *PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES, BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, *SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT, INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

THE FOCUS OF THIS STUDY WAS ON LOCATING REGULARITIES OR COMMON ELEMENTS IN HIGH SCHOOL SITUATIONS WHICH MIGHT BE ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOOL DAMAGE BY CHILDREN. RESEARCH WAS CENTERED UPON THE FOLLOWING STUDY ELEMENTS--(1) THE NATURE OF AN ACT OF VANDALISM, (2) THE SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHILDREN INVOLVED, (3) THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT INCLUDING SUCH FACTORS AS MORALE, TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIPS, AND EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS, AND (4) THE HOME ENVIRONMENT WITH REGARD TO THE ATTITUDE OF PARENTS TOWARD SUCH ACTS, TOWARD THE SCHOOL, AND TOWARD SOCIETY VALUES. THE STUDY SAMPLE INCLUDED THE HISTORY AND DAMAGE SCALE RATING OF 16 HIGH SCHOOLS. INTERVIEW ANSWERS FROM APPROXIMATELY 350 TEACHERS, AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES FROM 1,170 STUDENTS. PROJECT RESULTS SHOWED THAT MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RELATIVE AMOUNT OF SCHOOL DAMAGE AND TO A HIGH RATE OF VANDALIC STUDENT BEHAVIOR INCLUDED SUCH FACTORS AS (1) LOW SOCIOECONOMIC COMMUNITY STATUS AND HIGH COMMUNITY TRANSIENCY, (2) HIGH LEVELS OF SCHOOL CHANGE AND INSTABILITY, (3) LOW LEVEL OF PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION WITH A SCHOOL AND ITS GOALS AMONG STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PARENTS, (4) INADEQUATE ADMINISTRATION AND LEADERSHIP, AND POOR COMMUNICATION WITHIN A SCHOOL, (5) POOR INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WITHIN A SCHOOL AND BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND FAMILY, AND (6) LOW LEVEL OF SCHOOL MORALE. IT WAS ALSO SHOWN THAT CERTAIN SITUATIONS AROUSE STRAIN OR INSECURITY IN ANY SOCIAL GROUP OR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION. EXPECTATIONS WERE THAT EDUCATORS MADE AWARE OF THESE STRAINS COULD THEN DEVELOP METHODS FOR MINIMIZING DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR BY STUDENTS. (JH)

ED 002807

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SCHOOL VANDALISM

by

Nathan Goldman, Project Director
Dept. of Sociology, Syracuse University

Research Associates	Research Assistants
Robert Bickel	George Bodine
Lila Piper	Mary Cranston
Vincent R. Rogers	Carole Fisher
William Rosengren	Elsa W. Goldman
	Richard S. Saul

FINAL REPORT

31 JULY 1959

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION CONTRACT NO. SAE 181 (6453)

Syracuse University Research Institute

7648
235

A Socio-Psychological Study of School Vandalism

Nathan Goldman, Syracuse University

ABSTRACT

The focus of this study was on the regularities or common elements in school situations which might be associated with school damage by children. Schools rated high in damage were compared with those rated low, on a series of socio-psychological variables. Emphasis was placed on the complex of interpersonal relations in the school situation between principal, teachers, students and parents.

Sixteen junior high schools, junior-senior high schools and all-senior high schools in the city of Syracuse served as the sample for study. Each school was examined and rated on a damage scale created for this study. 367 teachers were interviewed individually and responses obtained from 1170 students on a questionnaire. These data were treated with the school as the unit of comparison. Rank order correlations were computed between school rating on damage and rank on the various items in the teacher interview and student questionnaire. In addition, histories of each school were obtained in an attempt to find some differentiating characteristics of high and low damage schools.

Low socio-economic status and high instability or transiency in the school community ~~in which the school was located~~, and change and instability in the school situation were found related to the relative amount of school damage. A low level of personal identification with the school and its goals among students, teachers, and parents was found positively associated with a high rate of vandalic behavior among students. High damage schools, also, were found characterized by inadequate administration and leadership, with poor communication among the various members of the school. In such schools, furthermore, relatively poor interpersonal relations were found between principal and teacher, teacher and teacher, student and teacher, parent and teacher, and custodian and student. The feeling that the school administration was not sufficiently concerned with the welfare of staff and students was found associated with a low level of school morale.

It must be recognised that probably no school will exhibit all the factors found positively associated with high damage and low morale. On the other hand, no school will be completely free of any of these items. Also, the presence of an unsalutory factor or item may be effectively counteracted by strength in another area. It is probable, therefore, that the presence in the

school of a preponderance of damage-related factors over wholesome factors may provide a fertile soil for vandalism.

It was shown that certain situations arouse strain or insecurity in any social group. These were seen related to the empirical findings of this study. It was suggested, to educators, that techniques designed to relieve these strains will aid in minimizing destructive behavior by students.

Acknowledgments

This study could not have been undertaken without the aid and cooperation of a number of people, to whom grateful appreciation is hereby acknowledged. Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Paul A. Miller and his two assistant superintendents, Dr. Harold L. O'Neal and Gerald A. Cleveland gave freely of their counsel, and made it possible for the study to be done by presenting it in a favorable light to the Board of Education and by arranging for us to meet with the school principals. Dr. Lee G. Grebner and David S. Sine of the Bureau of Research of the Board of Education aided by their advice and encouragement.

Our primary indebtedness is to the principal and staff of each of the sixteen schools in which we studied the problem of property damage. The principal of each school in our study gave freely of his time and shared with us his knowledge of the school and its pupils, and his insights into child behavior accumulated over years of teaching and administration. An Advisory Committee of five school principals, William F. Bowen, Wallace J. Bronner, Robert W. Oliver, Dr. Jesse Ross, and Frederick W. Whiteside provided valuable guidance in programming the research, and served as a sounding board for testing some of our research ideas. In each school the assistant to the principal facilitated our work by aiding with the teacher interview schedules and the administration of the pupil questionnaire, as well as contributing his ideas to the information we gathered.

The teachers, counsellors and students provided us with the basic data in the study. They shared their experiences and ideas with us, and subjected themselves to our probing questions. The various school custodians cheerfully conducted us around the school plants and helped us in viewing the problem by relating their experiences with children who committed acts of damage to the school.

A number of individuals in the community aided us in this study. Chief of Police Harold L. Kelly, and Capt. Leon Burchard of the Youth Bureau, Sheriff Albert E. Stone, and Sergeant Arthur Willis of the Youth Bureau of the Sheriff's

office were helpful with information on vandalism in the city and the county. The Hon. Leo J. Yehle, Judge of the Onondaga County Childrens Court aided the project by his interest and support. The Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Callahan, Superintendent of Schools of the Diocese of Syracuse, advised us on vandalism in parochial schools in the city. Administrative supervisors of the Syracuse Transit Corporation discussed with us damage by school children to their busses.

In addition we owe thanks to a number of social workers, PTA groups, and other interested citizens, who, through their interest encouraged us in our work. To Dr. Linton R. Freeman and to Robert H. Hardt, we are indebted for advice on statistics and research methodology.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements i
Table of Contents iii
List of Tables iv

The Problem

Introduction 1
References 7

The Project

Organization of the Project 8
The Research Design 12
The Participating Schools 14
Damage Rating 15
Pilot Study 19

The Results

School Characteristics and Damage 20
Teacher Interviews 26
Student Questionnaire Responses 58
School Histories 90

Conclusions

Summary and Conclusions 102
Discussion. Implications for Educators 110
Bibliography 115

Appendixes

A. School Building Property Damage, by Robert G. Bickel 116
B. Teacher Interview Questions 127
C. Analysis of Teacher Interviews 129
D. Pupil Questionnaire 134
E. Outline for Obtaining School History 140
F. Interpersonal Factors in the Disposition of Juvenile Offenders: Police and Janitors as Apprehenders, by William R. Rosengren 142
G. A Survey of Vandalism and Its Cultural Antecedants on Four New York State Indian Reservations, by Carol A. Fisher 147

List of Tables

Table — Page

1. School Damage Ratings 17
2. School Characteristics and Damage Rank 23
3. Grade and Subject Taught 27
4. Teachers Interviewed 29
5. Teachers Attitude Toward Property Damage 32
6. Teachers Knowledge of Property Damage 33
7. Location of Damage 35
8. Direction of Blame 36
9. Why Children Damage Property 38
10. Characteristics of Children Who Commit Damage 39
11. Teachers Familiarity with Parents 41
12. Parents' Attitudes Evaluated by Teachers 42
13. Why Schools Differ in Damage 43
14. Why Classrooms Differ in Damage 45
15. What Should Be Done About Damage 46
16. What Specific Action Should Be Taken 48
17. Teacher-Teacher Contacts 49
18. Principal-Teacher Contacts 50
19. Pupil Attitudes 51
20. Teachers' Evaluation of the School Administration 53
21. Teachers' Attitudes Toward the School 54
22. Teachers' Role Conception 55
23. Sex, Age, and Grade of Student Respondents 60
24. Why Do You Attend School? 62
25. How Does Your School Compare With Other Schools? 63
26. How Do You Get Along With Other Pupils In Your School? 64
27. How Do You and Your Friends Feel About the School? 66
28. What Do You Do When You Hear People Criticize Your School? 67
29. When You Hear People Talk About School Loyalty, What Do You Think It Means? 68
30. Do the Pupils Work To Make Your School Better? 69
31. How Do Your Parents Feel About Your School? 71
32. Do You Think Your Parents Are Interested In The School? 72
33. Are Students Allowed a Part In Planning School Programs? 73
34. What Do You Do About Extra-Curricular Activities? 74

35. Why Do Some Classrooms Have More Damage Than Others? 76

36. What Should Happen If A Pupil Damages School Property? 77

37. Why Do Pupils Damage School Property? 78

38. How Do Pupils Feel About Your Principal? 79

39. How Do You Feel About the Counsellors In Your School? 81

40. How Stict Are Your Teachers? 82

41. How Do Pupils Behave When You Have Substitute Teachers? 83

42. How Do Pupils Feel About the Custodian? 84

43. What Is Your Father's Job? 86

44. Does He Own His Own Shop, Business, or Office? 87

45. Do Your Parents Own Your Home? 88

Introduction

The willfull destruction or marring of works of art or of anything beautiful is defined technically as vandalism. A vandal is a person who, acting in the spirit of the ancient Germanic tribe of Vandals, destroys or mars works of nature or of man deemed by the society to be beautiful. In common usage however, this term has been extended to include the wanton and willful destruction of property of various sorts, whether beautiful or not. The criterion for labelling a given act as vandalism seems to lie more in the motivation of the act rather than the object involved. It is the malicious, irrational, or unrestrained quality of the act which defines it as vandalism.

Vandalism may occur in public or private settings. Acts of wanton destruction are frequently directed against parks, public buildings, houses of worship, cemeteries, national shrines, public transportation facilities, homes, automobiles, store windows, factories, etc. Such acts may occur under a variety of circumstances or motivations. Some may arise as a consequence of frustration, or out of the over-exuberant celebration of a sports victory or defeat, or out of a simple desire for self-aggrandizement, or in a spirit of revenge, or a variety of other reasons. The frustrated burglar, or student, or suitor may achieve temporary tension release by an act of vandalism directed against the source of his frustration. The gang boy may achiev prestige in his group by an act more daring or destructive than those of his friends.

An act of destruction of property may be premeditated, spontaneous, or accidental. It may begin for one reason and continue for an entirely different one. It may occur in the course of play in which a single window is broken accidentally, and then grow or mushroom into an orgy of competition out of which extensive window destruction will result. A group of boys who enter a school building intent on burglary may do considerable injury to the building when a single accidental act of damage becomes the stimulus for a rivalry situation in which each boy tries to outdo his friends in originality and in extent of destruction. The exuberant victors in the local annual high school football classic may discharge some of their aroused energies by damage to the public bus on which they are riding, ripping the seat covers, tearing the advertising posters, and scratching the symbols of victory on the interior of the bus.

Such acts of destruction may be individually directed, or group directed. They may arise from within a given individual, as an expression of his own frustrations, need for tension release, or his desire for recognition or prestige. They may also arise in the course of group activities, and represent the summation of the tensions of individual members of the group, or the operation of a group process of some sort. Such destructive behavior might be directed against an individual, an individual who represents an authority group, a material object which is identified with one of these, or against no one in particular. A specific act of vandalism may be aroused by any one of a variety of stimuli, and be directed against a variety of objects, and assume a variety of forms or modes of expression.

The problem of the wanton destruction of public property by adults and by children has received some consideration in the past few years. A review of the sociological, psychological and educational literature on vandalism may be found in a study by Wade (1). Acts of vandalism, frequently referred to as mischief, malicious, destruction of property, etc., in court and police records, have aroused public concern. The abuse of public property by tourists is spoken of as a national disgrace. The cost of damage to public schools probably exceeds the cost of damage to other public and private buildings. The expense of repairing damage caused by vandals to schools is an unnecessary addition to the already strained budgets of many of our public school systems.

In addition to the question of the cost involved, the destruction of school property is of interest and concern to the educator for a number of reasons. The destruction of school property may result in interference with the regular educational program. Broken windows may create physical discomfort in the classroom.

Damaged equipment, laboratory materials, audio-visual devices, books, desks, etc., - impede class progress. The destruction of lights, fire equipment, or of lavatory facilities may expose the students to unnecessary hazards to health or to life. In addition, the overt presence of depredations committed by classmates may have a harmful psychological effect on students.

Acts of vandalism in a school may be interpreted as an indication that somehow the school is not fulfilling its role of passing on the conventional societal values to the young. Such acts, also, may serve as a warning that the school may be operating in such a manner as to produce anxiety in the students. It might be an indirect yet potent suggestion that the curriculum, the interpersonal relations between students and staff, or the relations between school and community need to be examined. It might be, above all, an indication to the educator that the school is not adequately discharging its function of preparing the student for responsible citizenship.

From the point of view of the community, school vandalism is of concern because of its menace to the social order. The wanton destruction of school property represents a simultaneous threat to two important values of our society - education and property. The school vandal attacks both these highly valued institutions. He thus exhibits behavior hostile to certain crucial aspects of our accepted way of life. Such an attack on our institutional values by the child may be a portent of more serious attacks on society when he reaches the adult stage.

School vandalism, to the student of juvenile delinquency, represents a special and interesting form of anti-societal conduct. The vandal usually acquires little or no profit from his act. He may possibly achieve some prestige by his daring and by his defiance of school authorities. However, in accepting the plaudits of his peers he exposes himself to identification and apprehension by the authorities. The vandal more probably experiences some sort of psychological tension release in his destruction of property. He is probably expressing overtly his attitudes toward the school, or toward the school personnel, or towards other persons who may somehow, in his thinking, be associated with the school. School vandalism is thus probably a means of achieving release of tensions resulting from frustrations experienced either in the school situation, in the community or in the home.

The problem of damage to public property by the citizens of New York City was examined by Robert Moses, (2) He indicated that damage to the N. Y. Public Library, and theft and destruction of books, cost the city an estimated $10,000 a year. A good deal of the damage to books consisted in tearing out pages or sections of encyclopedias, dictionaries and anthologies. Park and playground loss in 1949 was estimated to be over $200,000. Vandalism consisted in the smashing of drinking fountains, damage to signs, breaking or mutilating statues, cutting fences, breaking benches, damaging playground equipment, smashing light bulbs and globes, the destruction of trees, shrubs and lawns.

The following estimates of the annual cost of damage to Chicago school and municipal property were made by Delaney in 1951,(3).

School window breakage	-	$250,000
Coal cost due to breakage	-	8,440
Larceny and Burglary	-	12,500
Parks (property destruction)	-	50,000
Municipal (street lights)	-	75,000

The cost of window breakage alone, for the year 1949, to a group of cities of varying school populations is reported by Delaney as follows: Pittsburgh, Pa., $27,333.58; Somerville, Mass., $2,956.56; Flint, Michigan, $8,861.10; Omaha, Neb., $3,759.79; Philadelphia, Pa., $82,569.92.

Hynds cites the expenditure in New York City of $161,000 to repair school damage by vandals in 1939, (4).

The cost of school vandalism, primarily window breakage, was indicated at several points in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency held a few years ago. It was reported that in the District of Columbia, more than $50,000 was spent annually to replace broken school windows. At the hearings in Boston it was revealed that the cost of window breakage in public schools was $69,184 in 1952. This was lowered to $35,752 in 1953 after a campaign to reduce such damage. Glass breakage in Philadelphia schools in 1953 cost the city about $100,000, (5). Testimony given at the hearings in San Francisco placed the cost of glass breakage in schools at about $20,000 annually, and the cost of all damage to schools between $60,000 and $80,000 per year.

In Syracuse, N. Y. where the present study was conducted, it was estimated that the cost of replacing broken windows in the schools in 1956 was $13,814.25, (6). In the nine year period, 1948 through 1956, this cost varied from a low of $7,886.72 to the high reported above for 1956. It was indicated, also, that window breakage was the major portion of the damage to schools, with some, but relatively little, damage to lavatories, classrooms, etc.

A variety of causes for damage to public schools have been posited by investigators. Some find the cause in the child, some in the parents and some in the school. Recommendations for the "cure" of vandalism vary from removing stones and rubbish from areas around the school, punishing the parents, offering prizes to the schools with the lowest damage records, etc. Bristow and Lazes (7) indicated that in a survey of some schools in New York City the causes given for school damage ranged "from debris easily available because of construction work going on, a grudge against the teacher, and holidays like Halloween, to one child who was challenged by another to show how good his aim was". They give a list of causes they found commonly mentioned: "unguarded windows, particularly on the lower floors; stones and rubbish in areas around the school building (vacant lot, unpaved playground, and so forth); periods of unsupervised play after school, weekends, and holidays; inadequate custodial services; inadequate locking of gates and unguarded entrances to the buildings; delay in repairing broken panes."

The recommendations for the prevention of such vandalism reflect the various investigators' concern with the physical environment of the school and the use of techniques to motivate the children in the direction of favorable attitudes toward public property. Moses (8) found that damage to library books decreased when teachers were asked not to require their students to bring pictures to class. Spalding (9) mentioned the following recommendations of a committee in Hartford, Conn. regarding the prevention of vandalism:

(a) Provide regular police coverage.

(b) Remove rocks, sticks, bottles and other trash from school grounds.

(c) Stimulate schools to prevent such acts through awards such as library books, playground equipment.

(d) Make spot radio announcements, pointing up parental responsibility.

(e) No publication of acts of vandalism, remove damage to property immediately.

(f) Educate children to accept and carry out responsibilities, using discussion approach.

Other writers, more psychologically oriented, look for the causes of school property damage in the personality of the child. Clark (10) found in an analysis of college undergraduates' responses to a questionnaire dealing with the problem that the enjoyment of excitement and the stimulus of a crowd situation were the two motives most frequently mentioned. Boys, he found, were more frequently destructive than girls. Kvaraceus (11) related juvenile delinquency in general, not only school vandalism, to frustrating experiences to which the child is exposed in the school. Destructiveness of this sort is considered by Gardner as a result of the unrestrained expression of the aggressive-destructive impulses in the child's personality, (12). Such unrestrained expression is considered a symptom of personality disturbance.

We thus find a variety of causes of vandalism presented by educators, psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists and public administrators, ranging from inadequate custodial service, parental irresponsibility, to personality aberration in the child. Prescription for cure includes such diverse techniques as putting screens on vulnerable windows, frequent patrol of school building areas by police, making the parents pay for damage, improving the morale of students in the school. Actually, however, there has been no systematic research program to investigate the various possible causes of damage to public school property.

A study of the problem of property damage in public schools by children might provide data leading to the understanding and control of vandalism. Such a study, in addition to the saving of money which it might afford, might provide us with information helpful to the school administrator. An understanding of the factors which alienate the child from the school might help to maximize the effectiveness of classroom techniques. In addition, it might provide much needed understanding of a peculiar form of child misbehavior.

References

(1) Wade, Andrew L., Characteristics of Vandalism: A Review of the Literature. Mimeographed. Community Studies Inc., Kansas City Missouri, 1956.

(2) Moses, Robert, Vandals at Work. Nat. Assoc. of Sec. School Principals - Bulletin, 1950, 34, 97 - 104.

(3) Delaney, John F., Hidden Treasure. American School Board Journal, 1951, 122, 25 - 27.

(4) Hynds, H. D., The Prevention of Vandalism in School Buildings. Am. Sch. Bd. Journal, 1941, 103, 41.

(5) Note, above, that in 1949 the figure was reported as $22,569.92.

(6) Personal communication from the Director of the Bureau of Operation and Maintenance of the Board of Education, Syracuse, New York.

I7) Bristow, Wm. H., and Alex H. Lazes, Vandalism is Minimized by a Continuous Program of Constructive Citizenship. Nations' Schools, 1954, 53, 43 - 46.

(8) Op. cit.

(9) Spalding, H. G., Vandalism: No. 1 Flaw in 'Our Education for Citizenship', Scholastic, 1953, 61.

(10) Clark, W. H., Sex Differences and Motivation in the Urge to Destroy. Jour. Soc. Psychol., 1952, 36, 167 - 177.

(11) Kvaraceus, W. C., Delinquency: A By-Product of the School? School & Society, 1944, 59, 350 - 51.

(12) Gardner, G. E., The Community and the Agressive Child: The Expression of the Aggressive - Destructive Impulses in Juvenile Delinquent Acts. Mental Hygiene, 1949, vol. 33.

Organization of the Project

In the above - mentioned discussions the focus has been primarily on the student as the central factor in the causation of and the treatment of school vandalism. Some suggestions were found regarding the role of the parents and also the role of the school student body as a whole in the prevention of such behavior. From the point of view of the social psychologist, however, it is difficult to view an actor - in this case the student - as being the sole determinant of events in a social situation. The student acts in a situation involving other persons -- his classmates, the principal, teachers, custodians, parents, neighbors, etc. His behavior is the resultant of the convergence of a number of variables, many of which are external to the person. The traditions of the school, customs among the students, the orientation of the principal and the teachers with respect to their roles, attitudes of the parents and neighbors toward the school, etc., in part form the social situation in which the student finds himself.

It was felt that a study of school vandalism should concern itself with the pattern of interpersonal relations in the school, as well as with a consideration of the children directly or indirectly involved in the act of school damage. Although a specific instance of property damage might be the result of the activity of a given disturbed child, the presence of a high rate of damage in a school cannot be presumed a function of the chance or designed concentration of a number of such disturbed individuals in a given school. It is assumed in this study that schools with high damage rates may be distinguished from low-damage schools on the basis of the kinds of interpersonal relations maintaining between teachers and principal, teachers and students, principal and students, custodian and students, parents and teachers, etc. The history of the school with regard to "community relations", differences in the nature of the population from which students are drawn, differences in the participation of students in administrative decisions, etc., might be found to discriminate between high and low damage schools.

The broad hypothesis guiding this investigation was that the amount of damage in a school is a function of what might be broadly termed the "morale" in the school -- the identification of the students, the teachers, the parents, the custodian, and the principal, with the school. The alienation, to a considerable extent, of any of these groups from the rest might be considered as a serious breach of morale. Such a situation might be termed one of anomie, (13) in which the rules of conduct binding on the whole have lost their hold on some of the members of the group so that the behavior of individuals may be contrary to the best interests of the group.

For purposes of the study, school morale was roughly defined as the situation which obtains when the various members of the school -- students, teaching, administrative and custodial staffs, parents -- consider themselves a social group with common ends, and agreement on the proper means of achieving these ends. This might be observed in the expression of feelings of the member about the group -- pride or indifference at being considered a member. The level of morale might also be indicated by the nature of the interpersonal relations between different members of the organization. It was felt that the level of morale in a school could be evaluated through a study of interview or questionnaire responses obtained from various members of the school body.

In the early stages of the organization of the project, conferences were held with people in public and private agencies concerned with the behavior of children. Community acceptance of the project was obtained through conferences with members of the Council of Social Agencies, the Police Chief, the County Sheriff, members of the County Youth Board, the Judge of the Childrens Court and the Superintendent of Schools. Further discussions were held with various school principals, custodians, and teachers for the purpose of collecting insights into the nature of school property damage. The problem of school vandalism was discussed with the assistant superintendent of schools, personnel of the Research Bureau, and the Director of the Bureau of Operation and Maintenance.

Visits were made to a number of schools where kinds of vandalism experienced were discussed with the principal, with the custodian and with teachers. In some schools the opportunity was had to talk with student leaders about their knowledge of and attitude toward vandalism. These conferences served as a means of becoming acquainted with the Syracuse schools and the thinking of school personnel at various levels with respect to vandalism. It served as a foundation for the research approach we were to take.

It was felt, originally, that a fruitful approach to the problem would be in the study of individual children who had been apprehended in acts of vandalism. It was learned, however, that such children were rarely discovered. Also, it was our original plan to investigate instances of gross destruction, in which several rooms might be extensively damaged in an episode of vandalism. In our preliminary discussions it turned out that very few such incidents occurred in the Syracuse area in the period of a year. Moreover, the everyday damage to windows, books, equipment, desks, walls, etc. constituted a greater total cost to the schools than did the few spectacular events which came to the attention of the public.

It was decided, therefore, to focus the investigation on a consideration of the socio-psychological differences which might obtain between schools showing different degrees of damage of the everyday variety. The school thus would become the unit of study, instead of the individual vandal. The problem then was to obtain measures of differences in "morale", as defined above, in schools ranked low by this criterion.

Such an approach would necessitate the services of a staff composed of workers from various behavioral disciplines. Accordingly, the research staff was drawn from the areas of sociology, psychology, education and social work. The Director of the project, trained and experienced as a clinical psychologist, held a doctorate in sociology and was a member of the Department of Sociology at Syracuse University. He was assisted by a member of the faculty of the School of Education of Syracuse University. Several of the research assistants were graduate students in the

Doctor of Social Science program -- an interdisciplinary program aimed at training students to teach in the social sciences. Several social workers were employed from time to time for the purpose of interviewing teachers and students.

References

(13) **Merton, Robert K. Social Structure and Anomie. In SOCIAL THEORY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE, by Robert K. Merton, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1957.**

The Research Design

The purpose of this study was to discover the factor or factors in the school situation which might be associated with a high frequency of occurrence of property damage in the school. Our basic concern was with what we have termed the morale in the school, as reflected in the attitudes expressed toward the school, and in the relations between the various groups associated with the school -- teachers, students, administrative staff, custodian and parents. We were searching for some socio-psychological correlates of high damage in schools. A research plan or design was evolved, aimed at bringing into relief significant distinctions between schools ranking differently on a damage scale.

The research program or design was as follows:

1) The population sample studied consisted of all the public junior and senior high schools in the city.

2) A device to evaluate school damage was developed, and each school was ranked on the basis of a composite of several damage ratings.

3) A pilot study was conducted in a school not in the research sample.

4) The results of the pilot study together with the results of interviews with educators and others during the organization of the project provided the basic items used in the construction of an interview schedule for teachers and a questionnaire for students.

5) 367 teachers in the 16 schools were interviewed by a group of five interviewers using the prepared schedule.

6) Questionnaire responses were obtained from 1170 students selected from the sixteen schools.

7) The data were analyzed, considering each school as a unit and combining the schools into high, moderately high, moderate, moderately low, and low damage categories. The degree of association between damage rank and rank on any particular characteristic or item investigated was determined by the use of the Kruskal and Goodman Coefficient of Rank Association.

8) Histories of the schools were obtained, in order to uncover any relations between damage or morale in the school, and the background of the school, community changes, personnel changes in the school, changes in curriculum or program, or any events which might have affected the operation of the school.

9) Two ancillary studies were made, on Indian reservations, and in city parks. These will be reported as appendixes to this report.

The Research Sample of Schools

On the basis of discussions with school personnel and others it was decided that the public junior and senior high schools of the city of Syracuse would comprise the population to be studied. It was felt that most of the damage occurred during about the 9th and 10th years of school. At this time, many children are 16 years of age - the legal drop-our age in New York State. Also, it was suggested that the transition from junior to senior high school - from the 9th to the 10th grades - with the additional freedom in the high school for which children are not always prepared, was conducive to conduct disturbances. The departmentalization found in the junior high school breaks down the close personal tie the child had with a single teacher in a single room as an elementary school student, placing him in a relatively more objective, impersonal situation.

All of the sixteen public junior and senior high schools participated in this study. Five of these, located in different sections of the city were wholly senior high schools. Two were combined junior and senior high schools. Three others were entirely junior high schools. The remaining six were composed of combined elementary and junior high school grades. These schools were located in various sections of the city, each of which can be easily identified as a distinct community. At one extreme, two schools were in what was generally considered a slum area; at the other extreme was a school in an upper middle class residential area. Two schools in the "downtown" area served students from various parts of the city. One was a senior high school, the other a technical and industrial high school. The populations in each of the remaining schools was largely drawn from a given district of the city, the limits of which were set by the Board of Education.

The Damage Rating

A schedule for assessing damage in the school was designed after consultation with school administrators, teachers, students and custodians. All areas of probable damage were included, and items within these areas were listed. The detailed schedule, together with instructions for its use, may be found in Appendix A. One schedule was used for each school, the assessor including notations at appropriate points.

In order to minimize disruption of the school schedule, and to facilitate our observations, inspection of the schools were made very shortly after the beginning of the summer vacation, just before the summer cleanup had begun. One member of the staff visited fourteen of the schools in June and July of 1957. Eight of these schools were also rated by another observer during the same period. Two years later, when the study was near completion, the fourteen schools were again visited, for the purpose of assessing the amount of damage, by two members of the staff. In addition, two other schools were surveyed - one of which was not accessible at the time of the initial rating; the other had been added to the study after the initial visits had been made. Thus fourteen of the schools were examined twice, eight were inspected for damage three times, and two were surveyed only once. Each room used by junior or senior high school students was inspected. In some cases the custodian accompanied us; in others, we were given the master keys and freedom of the school building. In no instance were we denied entrance to any area.

Three separate ratings were thus obtained. Two ratings were made by individual raters, and the third, two years later, by two people working together. In some instances, when an area was not surveyed in a particular school, or an area was lacking (such as a cafeteria or auditorium) the average of all the school ratings for this area was used. Thus the final score for each school was the sum of the ratings of thirteen areas. The scores for each school supplied by the individual raters were summed, and an average score for each school obtained. This final score served as the basis for damage ranking of the schools.

Emphasis is placed, in the instructions for use of the damage schedule, of the distinction between indications of deliberate damage, and that resulting from normal use, or aging of the building or equipment. Also, damage which could easily be remedied in routine custodial practice - such as writing on walls - was to be considered less serious than damage the repair of which required more effort or money, such as scratched blackboards, gouged bulletin boards, broken windows, etc. The rater was expected to make an over-all assessment of an area, rather than a minute count of items damaged. This involved a judgment, to be sure, based on the individual acquaintance with schools in general. The first two raters were educators, both with teaching experience. One of the two assessors, on the second rating, had been associated with the Project for some time, and had paid several visits to each school. The other had been a junior high school teacher in another city.

Inspection of the ordered scores in Table 1 revealed a natural division into five groups. The average difference between school ratings was 1.5 points. However, at three points, the difference between a school and the next higher in damage rank was 2.7 or more, and at one other point, greater than 1.5 but less than 2.7. It was decided to use these "breaks" for setting up damage classes. Two schools stand out above all the others, and have a high damage score (H 1 and H 2). Five other schools, which seem to form a cluster, are rated as having moderately high damage (MH 1,2,3,4,5). The next four schools form a group which we shall call moderate in damage (M 1,2,3,4). The next three schools form a moderately low damage group (ML 1,2,3). Following these come two schools, which seem to group together, with low damage scores (L 1 and L 2). Schools MH 2 and L 1 were the ones which had not been viewed by either of the first two raters.

The degree of congruence of the damage rankings by the three raters may be seen in Table 1. Scores given by assessor number three seem to be consistently lower than those of the other two except at the lower damage levels. Also, there are some discrepancies between scores given by raters I and II. However, the rank order of the ratings of the three individuals is markedly consistent. The

TABLE 1
SCHOOL DAMAGE RATINGS

Rank	Rater I	Rater II	Rater III	Average Score
H 1	43.0	42.0	30.1	38.4
H 2	38.0	----	32.3	35.2
MH 1	35.0	27.0	31.8	31.7
MH 2	----	----	30.4	30.4
MH 3	34.0	32.0	24.0	30.0
MH 4	30.0	----	26.9	28.5
MH 5	34.0	33.0	17.4	28.1
M 1	25.0	30.0	21.3	25.4
M 2	25.0	----	23.0	24.0
M 3	25.5	----	21.5	23.5
M 4	28.8	23.8	17.8	23.5
ML 1	22.0	22.0	21.0	21.7
ML 2	22.0	----	20.0	21.0
ML 3	19.8	----	19.1	19.5
L 1	----	----	16.1	16.1
L 2	15.0	15.0	16.0	15.3

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) between 8 rankings by raters I, II and III = .77 (significant at the .05 level).

Kruskal-Goodman association between 14 rankings by I and II = .58

average school rank groupings, although based on different scores for each of the three investigators, show few disagreements. The damage group designations by rater I are consistent with the final average group position of the school. The damage class assignments by rater III deviate from the average in only four instances.

To measure the degree of consistency among the raters, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance test (14) was applied to the eight ratings made by the three observers. A coefficient of .77, significant at the .05 level was obtained, indicating a high degree of agreement in the ranks assigned by the three raters. The Kruskal-Goodman Coefficient of Rank Association (15) for the fourteen rankings of raters I and III was found to be .58, indicating that there was 58% more agreement than disagreement between these two rankers.

References

(14) Siegel, S. NonParametric Statistics. New York, Mc Graw-Hill, 1956, pp. 229-238.

(15) Freeman, Linton, A Measure of Association Between Classes and Ranks. Unpublished manuscript, mimeographed, Syracuse University, 1960.

The Pilot Study *

A small pilot study was conducted for the purpose of providing further help in organizing the project design. A member of the staff, a former junior high school teacher, obtained from the students in the school in which he had taught, written responses to the questions, What do you know about vandalism in your school?, and Why do children do such things? Responses were obtained from 115 children in this lower class school located some distance from Syracuse. The kinds of damage reported, in order of frequency of reporting were as follows: breaking windows, writing or carving on desks, writing on or defacing walls, damage to plumbing or tile in the washrooms, damage to lockers.

The reasons given for acts of vandalism ranged from boredom to lack of home training. The most frequent reason mentioned was boredom -- "nothing to do" -- in school, and after school hours. Hatred of school, or a desire to "get even" with a teacher for some real or imagined wrong was frequently mentioned. An unpopular or unattractive teacher was cited as arousing responses of aggression or destructiveness in the students. Next in order of frequency was the response "to have fun" or "for a thrill". Following the gang pattern -- "others do it" -- and the fear of being called "chicken" were mentioned as motives by some students. Finally, some indicated that the desire for attention, to be a leader or to "act big" caused some children to commit acts of damage.

This information on the location of school damage and reasons for such behavior was used in the construction of the damage scale, the teacher interview schedule, and the student questionnaire.

---

* Conducted by Richard S. Saul, graduate student, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

School Characteristics Related to Damage Rank

The sixteen schools ranked on damage were compared on a number of characteristics. To maintain the anonymity of these schools the detailed data cannot be given at this point. Therefore, only the obtained rank order association values will be presented in Table 2. In the following discussion a Kruskal-Goodman rank association value of .50 and above will be considered as "moderate", .40 to .50 as "limited", and .30 to .40 as "suggestive".

1. Population size. The size of the school, in terms of the student population, might be related to damage rank. With a large number of students it was considered probable that greater damage might occur than in schools of lesser population. The correlation of .05 suggests strongly that such a relation does not exist.

2. Age of the building. The age of the building, however, does seem to be positively associated with damage rank. A rank order correlation of .52 was obtained between age of school building and damage ranking. However, the effects of aging in itself was presumably excluded from our damage ratings. It is probable that the age of the school is related to damage rank indirectly, through a number of other variables such as community deterioration, plans to discontinue use of the building and consequent lack of concern by the administrative staff, lack of interest in education frequently found in areas of deterioration, etc.

3. Socio-economic rank of the school. A socio-economic index was obtained for each school by taking the median of the socio-economic ratings of the census tracts from which the school drew its students. The rating for each census tract was a composite of five items, including the percent of operatives, service workers and laborers, the median school year completed by the adult population, the percent of single family dwelling units, the mean value of owned homes, and the mean monthly rental of rented homes, (16). It appears from the low level of association indicated by the correlation of -.03, that the socio-economic rating of the areas from which the students come have no association with the ranking on the vandalism scale.

It was generally expected that we would find a strong association between high damage rates in the school and low socio-economic background of the students.

4. Pupil-teacher ratio. A high student-teacher ratio might be a situation conducive to restlessness, poor discipline, etc., which in turn, might be related to vandalism in the school. In Table 2 we note an obtained correlation of only .16 between high damage rank and high ratio of pupils to total faculty, including administrators, counsellors, and specialists. The relation is in a positive direction - the higher the ratio, the greater the damage. However, the magnitude of the association is below statistical significance.

5. Median class size. Although pupil-teacher ratio did not seem significantly associated with damage rating, median class size does seem to bear a somewhat stronger relation. A rank order association of .34, found between high ranking on median class size in the school, and the relative amount of damage suggests a positive relation between these variables. Physical crowding, rather than a high student per teacher ratio seems a possible factor in damage rating. Classroom crowding might result in overburdening the teacher, poor classroom discipline, student frustration, etc.

6. Pupil-janitor ratio. High damage might presumably be associated with inadequate custodial service, based on a limited janitorial force. A negative correlation was obtained between relative size of the custodial staff and the damage rank of the school. However, the magnitude of the correlation, only .14, is not sufficient for this relation to be other than very slightly suggestive.

7. Window breakage. Data on window breakage for the year 1956, before this study was begun, was obtained from the Director of the Bureau of Operation and Maintenance of the Board of Education. We were informed that about 75% of the window damage occurred during the period from 1 June to 1 October. Also, it was considered that this damage was not necessarily committed by the student body of the school. It was further pointed out that the proximity of a park, athletic field, or playground, isolation of the school from the public view, and unfavorable

community attitudes contributed to the high rate of broken windows in a school. The obtained correlation of .53 indicates a moderate positive relation between window breakage and ranking on our damage scale. It must be remembered that window damage constituted only a part of our total damage observations, and that our evaluation of each school was made early in the summer, very soon after the start of the summer recess, and that our observations were made, in any given school, on a single day. It is probable that the magnitude of the association value obtained is a reflection of the community attitude toward the school. The correlation between damage to windows in a year before we began this study, and the damage ratings we obtained in 1957 and 1959 suggests the reliability of our damage schedule.

8. Attendance rates. The average daily attendance rate was computed for each of the schools from a record of absences in each school during a given five week period. The obtained rank order measure of association of -.22 indicates a negative, but negligible relation between high damage rank and high rank on an attendance rating. High damage schools seem to have, to a slight degree, a higher absence rate than low damage schools.

9. Tardiness. An index of tardiness was computed for each school, using the same reporting period as for the attendance rate. The relation between rank on the damage scale and rank in tardiness was in the positive direction but significantly low, .18. High damage schools, but to a very slight extent, rank high also on tardiness rates.

10. Drop-outs. The sixteen schools were compared with respect to the drop-out rates for students in the junior and senior high school grades, for the academic year 1957-58. A rank order correlation of only .25 was obtained. Although this association was in the positive direction it was too low to be considered as meaningful. However, when the relation between damage rank and drop-out rates was computed for students in the seven junior-senior and all senior high schools it was found to bery significantly high, .89. That is, when we considered only the schools with older students, dropping out the elementary-junior and all-junior

TABLE 2

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS AND DAMAGE RANK.
TABLE OF CORRELATIONS.

		Correlation
1.	Population size	.05
2.	Age of building	.52
3.	Median socio-economic rank of census tracts served by the school.	-.03
4.	Pupil-teacher ratio	.16
5.	Median class size	.34
6.	Pupil-janitor ratio	-.14
7.	Window breakage, rank	.53
8.	Attendance rate	-.22
9.	Tardiness rate	.18
10.	Drop-out rate	.09
11.	Arrest rate	.27
12.	Father blue-collar occupation	.23
13.	Home ownership	-.21
14.	Socio-economic rank of census tract in which school is located	-.32

high schools, a strong positive relation appeared between damage rating and drop-out rates.

11. Arrest rates. The rank order correlations between damage rates and arrests for all offenses, arrests for acts of mischief or malicious mischief, and arrests for truancy, are significantly low. It was thought that vandalism in the school might be positively related to delinquent conduct in the community, especially acts of mischief or malicious mischief. The correlation of -.05 between damage rank and rate of arrest for mischief strongly contraindicates a relation in this area. In fact, the correlation is even in the negative direction. The correlation between damage rank and rates of total arrests and of arrests for truancy, .27 and .29 respectively, cannot be considered as more than slightly suggestive of an association between these variables.

12. Father's occupation. It had been suggested in interviews that a differential attitude towards property might be a concomitant of the economic situation in the home. Children from lower class families were considered to have less respect for property than children from middle class homes. In the questionnaire, which will be described below, given to over 1100 children, the father's specific job was asked for. Grouping the occupational categories of skilled craftsman, semi-skilled craftsman, service and protective workers, laborers, blue collar unspecified, and unemployed into a "non-white collar occupation" class, we found a correlation of only .23 with damage rank. There seems to be a positive but insignificant association, in our sample of children, between school vandalism and the proportion of fathers in "blue-collar" jobs.

13. Home ownership. Respect for property is commonly associated with the ownership of property. It was felt that there might be an inverse relation between the rate of home ownership by parents and amount of school damage. Rates of home ownership were obtained on the questionnaire referred to above, and correlated with damage rankings of the sixteen schools. The resulting rank order correlation, -.22, is in the proper direction but of insufficient magnitude to be considered

significant.

14. However, when rank order on damage and on the socio-economic level of the census tract in which the school is located were compared, a correlation of -.32 was obtained. This suggests that in schools located in areas of high socio-economic level, damage within the school is apt to be low.

Summary. Of the fourteen characteristics of the school or school population which we have considered up to this point, only four -- age of the building, rate of window breakage, drop-outs from senior or junior-senior high schools, and socio-economic level of the census tract in which the school is located -- seem to be associated with school damage ranking. Most of the other correlations, although statistically not significant were in the expected direction. A high pupil-teacher ratio, high median class size, high tardiness rate, high rate of arrest, high rate of total drop-outs, and high rates of fathers in blue collar occupations are all positively related to high vandalism rates. On the other hand, a high student-janitor ratio, high attendance rates, and high home ownership rates are negatively related to damage rank of the school -- that is, associated with low damage rates. These correlations, however, are not of sufficient magnitude to be considered significant. Size of student body, the socio-economic rating of the area served by the school, and arrests for mischief seemed to bear very slight, if any, relation to high damage in schools.

References

(16) Willie, Charles V. Socio-economic and Ethnic Areas of Syracuse, N. Y. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Syracuse Univ., 1957.

The Teacher Interviews

The sample. The project director addressed the staff of each school at one of its regular monthly meetings, explaining the nature of the project and asking for volunteers. It was pointed out that the project was being done under contract with the U. S. Office of Education. Research findings and other reports of the cost of school property damage were presented to the teachers. The design of the project was outlined, and the hypothesis proposed that the reasons for such damage might lie in the students, or in the inter-personal relationships within the school or in the school-community relations. The significance of such research for the improvement of public school education was emphasized. The teachers showed some hesitation with respect to participation in the project. They implied that there had been a considerable amount of psychological and sociological research done in the schools with little return to the school itself. Many of the investigations were in the nature of M.A. or PhD studies done by persons who used the school facilities but who gave nothing in return. The teachers were assured that the final results of the study would be made available to them.

An interview time schedule was posted on the bulletin board and the teachers signed up for a particular day and hour. Interviews were scheduled to be held in the schools, and with the cooperation of the principal either during the teacher's free period, or during a class period when a substitute was provided. In a few cases interviews were held after school hours in the school building. Many of the interviews were held in the teacher's room; some were held in the classroom. The interviewing staff consisted of five persons who had had considerable experience in interviewing people. Two of these were trained Social Workers, the third was an educator, the fourth was a woman who had had considerable experience in education plus administration of a group work children's agency, the last was a Sociologist who had had considerable experience interviewing as a Clinical Psychologist.

TABLE 3 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
GRADE AND SUBJECT TAUGHT

DAMAGE GROUP

	High		M. High		Moderate		M. Low		Low		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Jr. H.S.	11	22.4	61	47.3	63	79.7	51	64.6	15	48.4	201	54.8
Sr. H.S.	38	77.6	68	52.7	16	20.3	28	35.4	16	51.6	166	45.2
Subject												
English	12	24.5	29	22.5	15	19.0	16	20.3	5	16.1	77	21.0
Lang.	2	4.1	6	4.7	0	0	4	5.1	3	9.7	15	4.1
H.E.	1	2.0	6	4.7	7	8.9	3	3.8	1	3.2	18	4.9
Shop	3	6.1	8	6.2	12	15.2	4	5.1	2	6.5	29	7.9
Math.	3	6.1	11	8.5	9	11.4	10	12.7	3	9.7	36	9.8
Music	2	4.1	5	3.9	5	6.3	3	3.8	1	3.2	16	4.4
Sci.	5	10.2	16	12.4	8	10.1	9	11.4	4	12.9	42	11.4
Special	2	4.1	8	6.2	7	8.9	6	7.6	2	6.5	25	6.8
Phys. Ed.	3	6.1	7	5.4	2	2.5	5	6.3	4	12.9	21	5.7
Bus.	6	12.2	10	7.8	1	1.3	3	3.8	0	0	20	5.5
Art	1	2.0	5	3.9	2	2.5	3	3.8	1	3.2	12	3.3
Cit. Ed.	9	18.4	18	14.0	11	13.9	13	16.5	5	16.1	56	15.3
TOTAL	49	13.4	129	35.1	79	21.5	79	21.5	31	8.4	367	

On the basis of our conferences with school administrators, teachers, custodians and students, a schedule of questions was devised to assess the teacher's knowledge of school vandalism, his attitudes towards it, his own role conception in the school, and the nature of the interpersonal relations existing between him and students, administration, other teachers, and parents. All questions were open-ended questions, allowing considerable leeway for the interviewer in structuring the situation. The interviewers had been briefed on the use of the schedule of questions, and were informed of the areas which each question was to cover. An outline of the questions was used in each interview, and responses recorded in detail, insofar as possible. (See Appendix B.)

The sample consisted of 367 teachers, or 63.5% of the full time and part time teachers in the junior and senior high school grades in the city. Participation in the individual schools ranged from 32.6% to 96.5% of the teachers in each school. Almost half of the teachers in our sample taught English, Science, or Citizenship. Subjects as Art, Music and Foreign Languages had the smallest representation. The distribution of senior and junior high school teachers, and the subjects taught by the teachers interviewed are presented, according to the damage rank of the school, in Table 3.

Other characteristics of the total sample of teachers interviewed may be seen in Table 4. Women exceeded men by two to one. Slightly more than half the teachers were married. The age range was from 20 to over 60, with a slight predominance in the 50 to 59 year group, and low representation in the 20 to 29 and 40 to 49 year categories. About half of the teachers had taught sixteen years or more; 21% had taught less than six years. Half of the teachers had spent five years or less in their present school assignment; another 24.8% had been in the school between six and fifteen years. Slightly less than half had taught in more than four schools. However, since a couple of these schools were relatively very new, or had recently been assigned junior high classes, these figures are not to be considered an adequate index of the degree of familiarity of the teacher

TABLE 4
TEACHERS INTERVIEWED

		No.	%			No.	%
Single Men		58	10.4		1-5	169	46.1
Married Men		83	22.6	Years	6-15	92	24.8
Single Women		112	30.5	This	16-25	46	12.5
Married Women		134	36.5	School	26-35	46	12.5
					36--	14	3.8
	20-29	43	11.7		1	58	15.8
	30-39	82	22.3	Schools	2-3	146	39.8
Age	40-49	68	18.5	Taught	4-5	99	27.0
	50-59	99	27.0		6-7	47	12.8
	60--	75	20.4		8--	17	4.6
	1-5	79	21.5		None	34	9.2
Years	6-15	87	23.7	Highest	B.A.	93	25.3
Taught	16-25	54	14.7	Degree	B.A.+	108	29.4
	26-35	78	21.2	Earned	M.A.	80	21.8
	36--	69	18.8		M.A.+	52	14.2

with the school and its problems. More than 90% of the teachers interviewed had a bachelors degree or higher. More than 35% had an M.A. degree or higher. Only 6.5% of the teachers interviewed had no college degree. It must be remembered that some of our interviewees were nurses, shop teachers, or physical education instructors who may not have had college training.

Our sample of teachers does not constitute a random sample of the teachers in the sixteen schools, nor can it be considered as a representative sample. Since we had to rely on volunteers for our interviews we were limited in the sample available for study. However, the description of the population of volunteers indicates the representation of various age groups, men and women, married and unmarried, teachers with varying lengths of teaching and training experience, and teachers of most of the subjects in a high school curriculum. The focus, as far as curriculum was concerned, was on teachers of the generally required subjects - English, Science and Citizenship Education - who would have had experience with the bulk of the student population.

Analysis of the Responses

The detailed interview reports for each teacher were analysed independently by two raters in accordance with a set of categories which the staff had devised after all the interviews had been completed. The response categories may be seen in Appendix C . It was felt that these particular items might be related to, or throw some light on the problem of property damage in schools, distinguishing between high damage schools and low damage schools. Each of the two raters coded the items according to a detailed coding scheme. Disagreements in ratings were discussed by the two raters and the interview re-examined. In this way a final rating was obtained for each item. These ratings were later put on I.B.M. cards for analysis. The data in some of the coded categories contained relatively few cases. These were combined with an other category with which it has logically compatable. Therefore, the categories presented in the tables do not always include all categories into which the data were analyzed.

Each question on the interview was considered separately, but a response to a particular item was also recorded if made elsewhere in the course of the interview. Some of the questions will have several responses by the same teacher. In the tables, both the number of responses and the number of teachers responding will be given. Analysis of the data is further complicated by the fact that some of the categories into which the responses were broken down were not mutually exclusive. It should be noted, also, that some of the categories in the analysis and coding scheme, Appendix C , were combined for purposes of tabulation and statistical analysis.

Attitude toward property damage. The teacher's attitude toward the problem of school property damage was evaluated by the raters on the basis of an overall reading of the interview record. It may be seen in Table 5 that only nine of the 367 teachers were unconcerned about such activity by children. The remainder were classed as casual about the problem, somewhat concerned, or alert and concerned. The bulk of the interviews, 68.4%, were rated as manifesting mild or limited concern. Rank of school in percent of teachers showing moderate concern and rank on damage were negatively correlated (-.51). A limited degree of association, rank order correlation of .43, was found between high damage rating and the percent of teachers who appeared alert and concerned about the problem of school damage.

Knowledge of property damage. Some of the teachers appeared, when questioned, to be unaware of damage in the school, some seemed to have heard from others about such damage, some seemed to be casually aware of the problem in the school. However, an inverse relation, in terms of a rank order correlation of -.42, appears between the school rank on damage and the proportion of teachers aware or keenly aware of the problem as it affected the school. That is, there is an association, somewhat limited in degree, between high damage and low awareness of the problem of damage in the particular school. These data may be found in Table 6.

Location of damage. In Table 7 is listed the various areas of the building

TABLE 5 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
TEACHERS' ATTITUDE TOWARD PROPERTY DAMAGE

Percent of Teachers

	Unconcerned		Casual		Concerned		Alert		Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	0	0	0	0	10	50.0	10	50.0	20
H 2	1	3.5	9	31.0	15	51.7	4	13.8	29
SUM	1	2.0	9	18.4	25	51.0	14	28.6	49
MH 1	1	4.0	0	0	16	64.0	8	32.0	25
MH 2	0	0	0	0	8	57.1	6	42.9	14
MH 3	0	0	0	0	24	77.4	7	22.6	31
MH 4	0	0	3	18.8	10	62.5	3	18.8	16
MH 5	4	9.3	7	16.3	25	58.1	7	16.3	43
SUM	5	3.9	10	7.8	83	64.3	31	24.0	129
M 1	0	0	0	0	6	75.0	2	25.0	8
M 2	0	0	6	16.2	29	78.4	2	5.4	37
M 3	1	6.3	1	6.3	13	81.3	1	6.3	16
M 4	0	0	1	5.6	15	83.3	2	11.1	18
SUM	1	1.3	8	10.1	63	79.7	7	8.9	79
ML 1	2	5.6	3	8.3	31	86.1	0	0	36
ML 2	0	0	6	18.8	23	71.9	3	9.4	32
ML 3	0	0	1	9.1	9	81.2	1	9.1	11
SUM	2	2.2	10	12.7	63	79.7	4	5.1	79
L 1	0	0	0	0	4	26.7	11	73.3	15
L 2	0	0	2	12.5	13	81.3	1	6.3	16
SUM	0	0	2	6.5	17	54.8	12	38.7	31
TOTAL	9	2.5	39	10.6	251	68.4	68	18.5	367

Rank Order Association with High Damage

Concerned	-.51
Alert	.43
Unconcerned	.04

TABLE 6 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
KNOWLEDGE OF PROPERTY DAMAGE

Percent of Teachers Responding

	Unaware		Hearsay		Aware		Keenly Aware		Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	3	15.0	0	0	11	55.0	6	30.0	20
H 2	8	27.6	3	10.3	15	51.7	3	10.3	29
SUM	11	22.4	3	6.1	26	53.1	9	18.4	49
MH 1	1	4.0	3	12.0	21	84.0	0	0	25
MH 2	1	7.1	2	14.3	7	50.0	4	28.6	14
MH 3	1	3.2	3	9.7	22	71.0	5	16.1	31
MH 4	1	6.3	2	12.5	12	75.0	1	6.3	16
MH 5	10	19.3	3	7.0	26	60.5	4	9.3	43
SUM	14	10.9	13	10.1	88	68.2	14	10.9	129
M 1	0	0	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5	8
M 2	2	5.4	4	10.8	29	78.4	2	5.4	37
M 3	3	18.8	0	0	12	75.0	1	6.3	16
M 4	1	5.6	1	5.6	14	77.8	2	11.1	18
SUM	6	7.6	6	7.6	61	77.2	6	7.6	79
ML 1	9	25.0	3	8.3	24	66.7	0	0	36
ML 2	2	6.3	1	3.1	29	90.6	0	0	32
ML 3	1	9.1	0	0	10	90.9	0	0	11
SUM	12	14.9	4	5.1	63	79.7	0	0	79
L 1	0	0	0	0	12	80.0	3	20.0	15
L 2	2	12.5	1	6.3	12	75.0	1	6.3	16
SUM	2	6.5	1	3.2	24	77.4	4	12.9	31
TOTAL	45	12.3	27	7.4	262	71.4	33	9.0	367

Rank Order Association with Damage

Aware and Keenly Aware	-.42

reported by teachers as affected by vandals. Damage to the teachers' own room and to other non-teaching areas such as lavatories, equipment and auditorium, designated by "other" in the table, constitute more than half the total responses. A rank order correlation of .51 was obtained between damage rank and rank on frequency of responses locating damage in classrooms in general; of -.43 between damage rank and responses "other"; of -.20 between damage rank and responses locating damage in the teachers own room. Thus there seems to be a moderately high relation between high damage rank and rank of schools in which a high proportion of teachers are aware of damage in all classrooms of the building, a limited association between high rank on damage and low awareness of damage in areas outside the classroom, and only a suggestion of an association between low damage rank and the reporting of damage to a teacher's own classroom. In low damage schools teachers seemed somewhat more aware of what is going on in the building as a whole, and somewhat more apt to mention damage to his own classroom, than in high damage schools.

Direction of blame. A variety of factors or situations were blamed by the teachers for damage. Some blamed themselves or their colleagues, others the administrative staff, the students, the parents or the community in which the school was located, the age of the building, night classes, summer school classes, the organization of the school program, and the city-wide school system. In Table 8 , these data have been condensed into five categories. The highest correlation obtained, -.33, was between rank on damage and rank on naming the entire school staff as responsible for damage in the school. That is the data suggest that the higher the rank on damage, the lower the tendency for teachers to blame themselves and their colleagues for damage in the school. There was a very slight tendency (a correlation of .28) for teachers in high damage schools to blame the age and location of the building and also administrative problems for high damage. There seemed to be no special tendency in either high or low damage schools for teachers to blame themselves, the students, or the community for damage occurring to the school. The rank order correlations were -.09, -.06, and -.02 respectively.

TABLE 7 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
LOCATION OF DAMAGE

Percent of Responses

	Own Room		Classrooms		Other		Lockers		Windows		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	17	19.3	14	15.9	36	40.9	7	8.0	14	15.9	88	20
H 2	26	20.2	15	11.6	56	43.5	11	8.5	21	16.3	129	28
SUM	43	19.8	29	13.4	92	42.4	18	8.3	35	16.1	217	48
MH 1	21	18.4	20	17.5	56	49.1	7	6.1	10	8.8	114	25
MH 2	12	19.3	11	17.7	25	39.4	3	4.8	11	17.7	62	14
MH 3	18	15.9	13	11.5	58	51.3	3	2.7	21	18.6	113	31
MH 4	13	22.8	4	7.0	34	59.6	0	0	6	10.5	57	16
MH 5	32	22.7	28	19.9	58	41.1	11	7.8	12	8.5	141	40
SUM	96	19.7	76	15.6	131	47.5	24	4.9	60	12.3	487	126
M 1	6	18.8	4	12.5	15	46.8	0	0	7	21.9	32	8
M 2	26	23.2	11	9.8	48	42.9	1	8.9	26	23.1	112	37
M 3	14	28.0	4	8.0	23	46.0	6	12.0	3	6.0	50	16
M 4	14	24.6	8	14.0	31	54.4	2	3.5	2	3.5	57	16
SUM	60	23.9	27	10.8	117	46.5	9	3.6	38	15.1	251	77
ML 1	27	25.7	12	11.4	57	54.3	5	4.8	4	3.8	105	34
ML 2	20	19.2	11	10.6	57	54.8	2	1.9	14	13.5	104	31
ML 3	6	15.8	1	2.6	23	60.4	1	2.6	7	18.4	38	11
SUM	53	21.5	24	9.7	137	55.5	8	3.2	25	10.1	247	76
L 1	12	22.2	3	5.6	27	50.0	3	5.6	9	16.7	54	15
L 2	13	23.2	5	8.9	30	53.6	0	0	8	14.3	56	16
SUM	25	22.7	8	7.3	57	51.8	3	2.7	17	15.5	110	31
TOTAL	277	21.4	164	12.2	614	47.5	62	4.8	175	13.5	1292	358

Rank Order Association with Damage

Classrooms	.51
Other areas	-.43
Own room	-.20

TABLE 8 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
DIRECTION OF BLAME

Percent of Responses

	Staff		Building		Pupil		Community		Other		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	25	28.7	13	14.9	20	23.0	19	21.8	10	11.5	87	20
H 2	25	25.0	22	22.0	29	29.0	23	23.0	1	1.0	100	29
SUM	50	26.8	35	18.7	49	26.2	42	22.5	11	5.8	187	49
MH 1	31	26.3	20	16.9	25	21.2	24	20.3	18	23.7	118	25
MH 2	20	32.6	8	13.0	14	22.8	13	21.2	4	6.5	59	14
MH 3	48	34.3	22	15.7	31	22.1	28	20.0	11	7.7	140	31
MH 4	18	29.2	13	21.2	16	26.0	12	19.5	0	0	59	16
MH 5	38	26.2	33	22.8	40	27.6	26	17.9	8	5.6	145	43
SUM	155	29.8	96	18.4	126	24.2	103	19.8	41	7.9	521	129
M 1	10	29.4	5	14.7	8	23.5	8	23.5	3	8.8	34	8
M 2	40	38.4	19	15.8	31	25.8	25	20.8	5	4.2	120	37
M 3	19	30.6	13	21.0	16	26.0	11	17.7	3	4.8	62	16
M 4	21	31.9	12	18.2	18	27.3	15	22.7	0	0	66	18
SUM	90	31.9	49	17.4	73	25.9	59	20.9	11	4.0	282	79
ML 1	55	37.2	20	13.5	36	24.3	29	19.6	8	5.5	148	36
ML 2	36	29.9	23	19.2	32	26.7	28	23.3	1	0.8	120	32
ML 3	19	35.9	9	17.0	11	20.7	11	20.7	3	5.7	53	11
SUM	110	34.2	52	16.2	79	24.6	68	21.2	12	3.7	321	79
L 1	16	30.2	10	18.4	14	26.4	11	20.7	2	3.8	53	15
L 2	17	28.3	10	16.7	16	26.7	13	21.7	4	6.7	60	16
SUM	33	29.2	20	17.7	30	26.5	24	21.2	6	5.3	113	31
TOTAL	438	30.7	252	17.7	357	25.1	29	20.8	81	5.7	1424	367

Rank Order Association with Damage

Staff	-.33	Pupils	-.06
Building and "other"	.28	Community	-.02

Why children damage school property. Teachers were asked to give their opinions why children committed acts of damage to the school. It was expected that teachers in low and high damage schools would show differences in their interpretations of such behavior. The responses were classed under boredom, doodling or "having fun", status maintenance among the peer group (including the gang), and revenge. More than one third of the responses designated damage as unwitting doodling or as occurring not as a deliberate act of destructiveness but in a spirit of "fun". The association between damage rank and rank order on the relative frequency of such responses was, however, statistically insignificant. The response of "boredom" was positively associated to a limited degree with high damage rating of the school (Table 9). The correlation of the proportion of teachers giving "revenge" as a motive for damage and damage rank of the school was negative and low. Thus, teachers in low damage schools tended, although to a very limited degree, to look at damage conduct as an expression of a revenge motive or as a concommitant of "fun", while in high damage schools teachers focussed more on the child's boredom, disinterest in school and his involvement in group directed behavior -- status maintenance in the peer group or gang control.

Children who commit damage. It was thought that teachers in the various schools might focus on different characteristics of the child in relation to the commission of acts of vandalism. This hypothesis was not corroborated by our data. Although in a high proportion of teachers' responses inadequate home training and broken homes were blamed for school vandalism, the degree of association of the frequency of these responses with school damage rank was negligible. The other items, in Table 10, also showed no statistically significant relation to damage rank. There is a very slight suggestion, in terms of the negative or positive direction of the correlations, that the home, sex, age and grade of the child are associated with damage by teachers in high damage schools, while race, socio-economic background, and ability of the child are so considered by teachers in low damage schools.

TABLE: 9 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
WHY CHILDREN DAMAGE

Percent of Responses

	Boredom		Restless Doodle,Fun		Status,Gang		Revenge		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	12	19.0	21	33.3	13	20.6	17	27.0	63	20
H 2	16	15.1	46	43.4	26	24.5	18	17.0	106	109
SUM	28	16.6	67	39.7	39	23.1	35	20.7	169	49
MH 1	15	13.5	42	37.8	38	34.2	16	14.4	111	25
MH 2	7	15.4	11	24.2	15	33.0	8	17.6	41	14
MH 3	19	17.1	35	31.5	34	30.2	23	20.7	111	31
MH 4	9	16.1	26	46.5	20	35.7	1	1.8	56	15
MH 5	18	15.1	43	35.8	36	30.0	23	19.2	120	40
SUM	68	15.5	157	35.8	143	32.6	71	16.2	439	125
M 1	4	16.7	10	41.7	4	16.6	6	25.0	24	8
M 2	12	13.6	34	38.6	20	22.7	22	25.0	88	35
M 3	8	14.8	21	39.0	10	18.6	15	27.8	54	16
M 4	10	15.6	24	37.4	19	29.7	11	17.2	64	18
SUM	34	14.8	89	38.7	53	23.1	54	23.5	230	77
ML 1	12	10.4	44	38.2	35	30.4	24	20.9	115	35
ML 2	15	12.8	52	45.3	32	27.3	18	15.4	117	32
ML 3	7	17.5	16	40.0	9	22.5	8	20.0	40	11
SUM	34	12.5	112	41.2	76	27.9	50	18.4	272	78
L 1	6	14.3	14	33.4	11	26.2	11	26.2	42	15
L 2	4	9.1	17	38.7	9	20.5	14	31.8	44	16
SUM	10	11.6	31	36.0	20	23.3	25	29.1	86	31
TOTAL	174	14.5	456	38.1	331	27.7	235	19.6	1196	360

Rank Order Association with Damage

Boredom	.42
Revenge	-.31
Status - gang	.25
Restless - doodle - fun	-.17

TABLE 10 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN WHO COMMIT DAMAGE

Percent of Responses

	Sex Age, Grade		Race Socio-Ec.		Ability		Home		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	20	25.3	14	17.7	13	16.5	32	40.5	79	20
H 2	19	26.4	9	12.5	18	25.0	26	36.1	72	26
SUM	39	25.8	23	15.2	31	20.6	58	38.4	151	46
MH 1	20	21.2	22	23.4	23	24.4	29	30.8	94	25
MH 2	9	25.0	7	19.4	8	22.2	12	33.3	36	12
MH 3	16	14.3	26	23.2	29	25.9	41	36.6	112	31
MH 4	14	25.5	20	36.4	9	16.4	12	21.8	55	16
MH 5	23	20.1	28	24.6	25	22.0	37	32.5	113	43
SUM	82	20.0	103	25.2	94	23.0	131	32.0	410	127
M 1	7	25.9	4	14.8	8	29.6	8	29.6	27	8
M 2	17	19.1	24	26.9	18	20.2	30	33.7	89	34
M 3	7	20.0	8	22.8	10	28.6	10	28.6	35	16
M 4	5	8.0	22	35.5	10	16.1	25	40.3	62	18
SUM	36	16.9	58	27.2	46	21.6	73	34.3	213	76
ML 1	23	25.3	20	22.0	22	24.2	26	28.6	91	34
ML 2	29	22.4	28	21.7	26	20.2	45	34.9	128	32
ML 3	10	25.0	7	17.5	8	20.0	15	37.5	40	11
SUM	62	23.8	55	21.2	56	21.6	86	33.2	259	77
L 1	12	27.3	9	20.4	10	22.7	13	29.5	44	14
L 2	9	19.6	14	30.4	9	19.6	14	30.4	46	16
SUM	21	23.4	23	25.5	19	21.1	27	30.0	90	30
TOTAL	240	21.4	262	23.4	246	21.9	375	33.4	1123	356

Rank Order Association with Damage

Home	.25
Ability	-.11
Race, Socio-economic background	-.09
Sex-age-grade	.05

Familiarity with parents. Another variable considered was the extent to which teachers in high damage and in low damage schools were acquainted with the parents of the students. It may be seen in Table 11 that in only 60, or 15.3% of the responses was there indicated more than a casual acquaintance of the teacher with the parents. In about 20% of the responses of the 360 teachers who answered this question it was indicated that the teacher's information of the family came either through hearsay or from the child. The obtained rank order correlation of .57 indicates a moderately high association between high damage rank and reports of teachers' minimal familiarity with the parents.

Parents attitude. The teachers were asked to evaluate the interest of the parents in the school. Over half of the responses were that the parents were interested. A few responses were obtained to the effect that the parents were overly interested to the point of being meddlesome and interfering. These responses were given mainly by teachers in schools in the low damage categories. On the other hand, responses of unawareness of parents' attitudes toward the school came largely from teachers in the high and moderately high damage schools. The rank order correlation of -.31 (indicated in Table 12) is suggestive of an association between teacher reports of high parental interest in the school and low damage rate in the school.

Why schools differ in damage. The teacher's reaction to the question, why do schools differ in damage rates, would further reflect his ideas regarding the causal factors in vandalism. The responses to this question, in terms of reference to neighborhood, the school building or physical plant, the students, or the school staff, are presented in Table 13. Over 90% of the responses referred to the neighborhood, the students, and the staff as determinants of differential damage between schools. There appears a moderate association, in teacher responses, between low damage rank and characteristics of the students as opposed to the neighborhood, the staff or the building. On the other hand, there seems to be a suggestion of an association between high damage rank and the proportion of teachers

TABLE 11 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
FAMILIARITY WITH PARENTS

Percent of Responses

	Hearsay		Child		Casual		Contact		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	3	11.5	6	23.1	9	34.6	8	30.8	26	20
H 2	6	18.8	2	6.3	22	68.8	2	6.2	32	28
SUM	9	15.5	8	13.8	31	53.5	10	17.3	58	48
MH 1	4	14.8	1	3.7	21	77.7	1	2.7	27	25
MH 2	4	26.7	1	6.7	8	53.3	2	13.4	15	13
MH 3	4	12.9	1	3.2	24	77.4	2	6.5	31	30
MH 4	2	11.8	1	5.9	12	70.6	2	11.8	17	16
MH 5	7	14.9	3	6.4	27	57.0	10	21.3	47	42
SUM	21	15.3	7	5.1	92	67.1	17	12.4	137	126
M 1	1	12.5	0	0	5	62.5	2	25.0	8	8
M 2	4	10.3	1	2.6	24	61.5	10	25.7	39	36
M 3	1	5.9	1	5.9	15	88.2	0	0	17	16
M 4	4	22.3	4	22.2	9	49.7	1	5.6	18	18
SUM	10	12.2	6	7.3	53	64.6	13	15.9	82	78
ML 1	4	10.2	3	7.7	23	59.0	9	23.1	39	36
ML 2	6	17.2	2	5.7	25	71.4	2	5.8	35	32
ML 3	0	0	0	0	6	54.6	5	45.5	11	11
SUM	10	11.7	5	5.9	54	63.5	16	18.8	85	79
L 1	0	0	0	0	11	84.6	2	15.4	13	13
L 2	2	10.5	0	0	15	79.0	2	10.5	19	16
SUM	2	6.3	0	0	26	81.3	4	12.5	32	29
TOTAL	52	13.2	26	6.6	256	65.0	60	15.3	394	360

Rank Order Association with Damage

Hearsay and Child +.57

TABLE 12 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
PARENTS' ATTITUDE AS EVALUATED BY TEACHERS

Percent of Responses

	Teacher Unaware		Indifferent		Interested		Meddlesome		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	0	0	27	96.4	1	3.6	0	0	28	20
H 2	3	9.1	11	33.3	19	57.6	0	0	33	29
SUM	3	4.9	38	62.3	20	32.8	0	0	61	49
MH 1	2	7.4	14	51.8	11	40.7	0	0	27	25
MH 2	0	0	3	18.8	7	43.8	6	37.5	16	14
MH 3	4	10.5	15	39.5	19	50.0	0	0	38	31
MH 4	1	6.3	2	12.5	13	81.3	0	0	16	16
MH 5	5	11.1	22	48.9	18	40.0	0	0	45	39
SUM	12	8.5	56	39.4	68	47.9	6	4.2	142	125
M 1	0	0	3	37.5	5	62.5	0	0	8	8
M 2	0	0	19	44.2	24	55.8	0	0	43	36
M 3	2	12.5	1	6.3	13	81.3	0	0	16	16
M 4	1	4.0	16	64.0	7	28.0	0	0	25	18
SUM	3	3.3	50	54.4	49	53.3	0	0	92	78
ML 1	1	2.7	6	16.2	30	81.1	0	0	37	35
ML 2	1	2.7	4	10.8	29	78.4	3	8.1	37	31
ML 3	0	0	9	60.0	6	40.0	0	0	15	11
SUM	2	2.2	19	21.3	65	73.0	3	3.4	89	77
L 1	0	0	7	50.0	5	35.7	2	14.3	14	13
L 2	0	0	2	12.5	13	81.3	1	6.3	16	16
SUM	0	0	9	30.0	18	60.0	3	10.0	30	29
TOTAL	20	4.8	162	39.1	220	53.1	12	2.9	414	358

Rank Order Association with Damage

Interested, and Meddlesome	-.31
Indifferent	.08

TABLE 13 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
WHY SCHOOLS DIFFER

Percent of Responses

	Neighborhood		Building		Students		Staff		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	38	39.3	9	9.3	24	24.7	26	26.8	97	20
H 2	43	31.9	19	14.0	34	25.2	39	28.9	135	29
SUM	81	34.9	28	12.1	58	25.0	65	28.0	232	49
MH 1	49	33.2	16	10.9	33	22.4	49	33.4	147	25
MH 2	16	32.6	4	8.1	10	20.4	19	38.8	49	14
MH 3	57	34.3	13	7.8	46	27.7	50	30.1	166	31
MH 4	26	35.2	8	10.8	23	31.1	17	23.0	74	16
MH 5	56	30.5	18	9.7	52	28.2	58	31.5	184	43
SUM	204	32.9	59	9.5	164	26.5	193	31.2	620	129
M 1	17	37.4	0	0	13	28.6	11	24.2	41	8
M 2	40	25.6	2	1.2	45	28.9	69	44.2	156	37
M 3	21	26.4	11	13.8	23	28.8	25	31.3	80	16
M 4	31	36.9	7	8.3	20	24.0	26	31.0	84	18
SUM	109	30.3	20	5.6	101	28.0	121	36.3	361	79
ML 1	63	33.6	13	6.9	50	26.7	61	32.6	187	36
ML 2	51	34.9	13	8.9	48	32.9	34	23.3	146	32
ML 3	19	32.7	4	6.9	17	29.3	18	31.0	58	11
SUM	133	34.0	30	7.7	115	29.4	113	28.9	391	79
L 1	23	31.1	4	5.5	25	33.8	22	29.7	74	15
L 2	30	37.6	7	8.8	23	28.8	20	25.1	80	16
SUM	53	34.4	11	7.1	48	31.1	42	27.2	154	31
TOTAL	580	33.0	148	8.4	486	27.6	544	31.0	1758	367

Rank Order Association with Damage

Students	-.53
Building	.37
Staff	.06
Neighborhood	-.01

who reported that schools differed in damage because of the characteristics of the school building. Teachers in high damage schools appear to focus on the physical aspects of the school, while those in schools ranking low in damage rather focus on the child as the basis for differential damage rates. The associations between damage and responses relating differential damage to the neighborhood, and to the school staff, are negligible.

Why classrooms differ. When asked to account for differences in the amount of damage in different classrooms, the teachers indicated in more than half of the total responses that the age, interest and ability of the students was the deciding factor. In high damage schools there was a slight tendancy, in contrast to low damage schools, for teachers to mention poor teacher control in the classroom -- weak discipline, the presence of a supply teacher, or the lack of identification of a particular room with a particular teacher -- as the reason for classroom damage. In low damage schools, however, there was a tendency to blame lack of teaching experience for damage in the classroom. The rank order correlations for these two items are, in Table 14, .33, and -.39 respectively.

What should be done about vandalism. Little difference was found in the responses of teachers in high and low damage schools to this question. Ninety-six percent of the responses were that either the teacher or the principal should handle the matter. Only 4% of the responses were to the effect that it should be ignored or turned over to the police. There seems to be no distinction between the responses of teachers in high damage schools and those in schools of low damage. It is of interest that, although the differences are not statistically significant, in the former the tendency was to have the principal deal with the vandal, while in the low damage schools the suggestion was that the matter be left to the teacher to handle. The data are presented in Table 15.

How should vandalism be treated. There were no significant differences in the responses of teachers in our total sample with respect to what should be done with a child apprehended in an act of damage. Although almost half of the responses

TABLE 14 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
WHY CLASSROOMS DIFFER

Percent of Responses

	Class Size Subject		Pupil Interest		Teacher Experience		Teacher Control		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	6	11.1	32	59.3	2	3.7	14	25.9	54	20
H 2	14	15.4	51	56.0	0	0	26	28.6	91	29
SUM	20	13.8	83	57.3	2	1.4	40	27.7	145	49
MH 1	16	16.2	47	47.4	3	3.0	33	33.3	99	25
MH 2	3	12.5	6	25.0	0	0	15	62.4	24	14
MH 3	6	5.5	65	59.6	5	4.6	33	30.3	109	31
MH 4	5	9.8	30	58.8	2	3.9	14	27.5	51	16
MH 5	8	7.3	58	52.7	4	3.6	40	36.3	110	43
SUM	38	9.7	206	52.4	14	3.6	135	34.3	393	129
M 1	6	18.8	17	53.2	1	3.1	8	25.0	32	8
M 2	1	1.1	61	64.2	5	5.3	28	29.5	95	37
M 3	5	9.8	27	53.0	1	2.0	18	33.3	51	16
M 4	2	4.1	28	57.1	1	2.0	18	36.7	49	18
SUM	14	6.1	133	58.7	8	3.5	72	31.7	227	79
ML 1	15	12.2	67	54.5	2	1.6	39	31.8	123	36
ML 2	15	14.6	65	63.2	2	1.9	21	20.4	103	32
ML 3	5	11.3	24	54.5	3	6.8	12	27.3	44	11
SUM	35	12.9	156	57.8	7	2.6	72	26.7	270	79
L 1	3	6.7	29	64.4	4	8.9	9	20.0	45	15
L 2	5	8.5	34	57.6	4	6.8	16	27.1	59	16
SUM	8	7.7	63	60.6	8	7.7	25	24.0	104	31
TOTAL	115	10.1	641	56.3	39	3.4	344	30.1	1139	367

Rank Order Association with Damage

Teacher experience	-.39
Teacher control	.33
Pupil interest	-.27
Class size and Subject	.20

TABLE 15 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
WHAT SHOULD BE DONE

Percent of Responses

	Ignore		Teacher		Principal		Police		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	0	0	9	40.9	12	54.5	1	4.5	22	16
H 2	1	2.9	14	40.0	18	51.4	2	5.7	35	29
SUM	1	1.8	23	40.4	30	52.6	3	5.3	57	45
MH 1	0	0	13	44.8	16	55.2	0	0	29	24
MH 2	0	0	9	64.3	5	35.7	0	0	14	14
MH 3	0	0	17	65.4	9	34.6	0	0	26	26
MH 4	2	10.0	12	60.0	6	30.0	0	0	20	14
MH 5	1	2.3	25	56.8	18	40.9	0	0	44	37
SUM	3	2.3	76	57.1	54	40.6	0	0	133	115
M 1	0	0	3	37.5	5	62.5	0	0	8	6
M 2	1	2.4	27	64.3	14	33.3	0	0	42	35
M 3	0	0	8	50.0	7	43.8	1	6.3	16	13
M 4	1	4.5	15	68.2	6	27.3	0	0	22	17
SUM	2	2.3	53	60.2	32	36.4	1	1.1	88	71
ML 1	0	0	16	39.0	23	56.1	2	4.9	41	34
ML 2	1	2.8	21	58.3	13	36.1	1	2.8	36	31
ML 3	0	0	9	64.3	4	28.6	1	7.1	14	11
SUM	1	1.1	46	50.5	40	44.0	4	4.4	91	76
L 1	0	0	6	50.0	6	50.0	0	0	12	11
L 2	1	5.0	13	65.0	6	30.0	0	0	20	15
SUM	1	3.1	19	59.4	12	37.5	0	0	32	26
TOTAL	8	1.7	217	54.1	168	41.9	8	2.0	401	333

Rank Order Association with Damage

Teacher	-.18
Principal	.17
Principal and Police	.14

were that the pupil should make restitution for the damage commited, the rank order correlation in this instance was only .13. The other obtained correlations, given in Table 16, were even lower. Thus in schools of all damage ranks there is a variety of opinions on the handling of cases of vandalism.

Teacher-teacher contacts. Responses to this item were obtained in only fourteen of the schools. It was reasoned that there might be more interpersonal contacts among teachers in schools of low damage than in the others. The findings, in Table 17, indicate a limited degree of association between frequent unplanned or spontaneous social contacts between teachers, both inside and outside the school, and low damage rank of the school. The rank order correlation of .34 is suggestive of an association between high damage rank of the school and the percent of teachers who report their contacts with fellow teachers to be limited to purely professional contacts in the school and common use of the lunch room.

Principal-teacher contacts. Only about one fourth of the 367 teachers responded to our questions regarding their relations with the school principal. Of this number, however, about 70% reported that the principal maintained an "open door" policy, or that interviews could be initiated informally by the teacher or by the principal. The rank order correlation of -.57 indicated in Table 18, is indicative of an association between low damage rate and an informal relation between teacher and principal. In high damage schools contacts between the teacher and principal are more apt to be formally initiated by the principal.

Pupil attitude. The teachers were asked to evaluate the pupil attitude toward the school. Slightly more than half felt that their students were enthused about the school, or held it in respect. Only seven or 2.3% of the teachers felt that their students hated the school; four of these teachers were in high or moderately high damage school. A rank order correlation of .41 between high damage rank and high percent of teachers who felt that their students were casual or indifferent toward the school is indicated in Table 19. The correlation between high rank on damage and high proportion of teachers who reported their students to bear an

TABLE 16 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
ACTION TO BE TAKEN

Percent of Responses

	Pupil Repair		Pupil Pay		Parent Pay		Principal Punish		Report to Police		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	8	34.8	9	39.1	5	21.7	1	4.3	0	0	23	15
H 2	14	50.0	5	17.9	6	21.4	2	7.1	1	3.6	28	24
SUM	22	43.1	14	27.5	11	21.6	3	5.9	1	2.0	51	39
MH 1	8	28.6	7	25.6	5	17.9	6	21.4	2	7.1	28	25
MH 2	9	60.0	5	33.3	1	6.7	0	0	0	0	15	12
MH 3	15	53.6	7	25.0	1	3.6	3	10.7	2	7.1	28	24
MH 4	7	53.8	1	7.7	2	15.4	3	23.1	0	0	13	11
MH 5	16	45.7	11	31.4	5	14.3	3	8.6	0	0	35	28
SUM	55	46.2	31	26.1	14	11.8	15	12.6	4	3.4	119	100
M 1	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6	0	0	0	0	7	5
M 2	26	70.3	1	2.7	4	10.8	5	13.5	1	2.7	37	34
M 3	5	35.7	5	35.7	3	21.4	1	7.1	0	0	14	12
M 4	12	66.7	3	16.7	1	5.6	2	11.1	0	0	18	16
SUM	47	61.8	10	13.2	10	13.2	8	10.5	1	1.3	76	67
ML 1	15	34.9	8	18.6	7	16.3	12	27.9	1	2.3	43	31
ML 2	13	43.3	7	23.3	5	16.7	4	13.3	1	3.3	30	24
ML 3	6	50.0	4	33.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	0	0	12	10
SUM	34	40.0	19	22.4	13	15.3	17	20.0	2	2.4	85	65
L 1	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3	2	18.2	0	0	11	10
L 2	6	33.3	9	50.0	2	11.1	1	5.6	0	0	18	12
SUM	10	34.5	11	37.9	5	17.2	3	10.3	0	0	29	22
TOTAL	168	46.7	85	23.6	53	14.7	46	12.8	8	2.2	360	293

Rank Order Association with Damage

Pupil Repair	.13
Principal Punish, Report to Police	-.09
Parents Pay	.02
Pupils Pay	.00

TABLE 17 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
TEACHER - TEACHER CONTACTS

Percent of Responses

	Minimal		Coop. Prof.		Lunch Room		Planned Social		Unplanned Social		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	13	43.3	1	3.3	7	23.3	5	16.7	4	13.4	30	18
H 2	23	60.5	4	10.5	6	15.8	5	13.2	0	0	38	25
SUM	36	52.9	5	7.4	13	19.1	10	14.7	4	5.8	68	43
MH 1	13	41.9	3	9.7	1	3.2	11	35.5	3	9.6	31	24
MH 2	8	57.1	2	14.3	1	7.1	3	21.4	0	0	14	13
MH 3	8	16.0	10	20.0	6	12.0	15	30.0	11	22.0	50	29
MH 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
MH 5	2	3.1	18	28.1	1	1.6	24	37.5	19	29.7	64	35
SUM	31	19.5	33	20.8	9	5.7	53	33.3	33	20.7	159	101
M 1	0	0	5	50.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	1	10.0	10	7
M 2	2	3.5	19	32.8	5	8.6	21	36.2	11	19.0	58	34
M 3	4	16.0	6	24.0	4	16.0	5	20.0	6	24.0	25	13
M 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SUM	6	6.5	30	32.3	11	11.8	28	30.1	18	19.3	93	54
ML 1	7	7.8	14	15.6	8	8.9	16	17.8	9	14.4	54	32
ML 2	5	8.9	7	12.5	7	12.5	20	35.7	17	30.3	56	28
ML 3	2	50.0	1	25.0	0	0	0	0	1	25.0	4	4
SUM	14	12.3	22	19.3	15	13.2	36	31.6	27	23.7	114	64
L 1	9	45.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	2	10.0	20	14
L 2	2	8.3	2	8.3	2	8.3	10	41.7	8	33.3	24	13
SUM	11	25.0	5	11.4	4	9.1	14	31.8	10	22.7	44	27
TOTAL	98	20.5	95	19.9	52	10.9	141	29.5	92	19.3	478	289

Rank Order Association with Damage

Unplanned Social	-.40
Minimal, Professional, Lunch	.34
Minimal	.24
Planned and Unplanned Social	-.16

TABLE 18 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
PRINCIPAL - TEACHER CONTACTS

Percent of Teachers

	Formal		Principal Initiates		Principal or Teachers		Open Door		Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	2	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
H 2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0	0	0	2
SUM	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0	0	0	4
MH 1	13	68.4	1	5.3	4	21.1	1	5.3	19
MH 2	5	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
MH 3	0	0	0	0	10	90.9	1	9.1	11
MH 4	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	1	50.0	2
MH 5	2	40.0	0	0	2	40.0	1	20.0	5
SUM	20	47.6	1	2.4	17	[illegible].5	4	9.5	42
M 1	0	0	0	0	3	100.0	0	0	3
M 2	0	0	0	0	4	80.0	1	20.0	5
M 3	0	0	0	0	2	100.0	0	0	2
M 4	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	----
SUM	0	0	0	0	9	90.0	1	10.0	10
ML 1	0	0	0	0	8	53.3	7	46.7	15
ML 2	2	11.1	1	5.6	7	38.9	8	44.5	18
ML 3	0	0	0	0	2	100.0	0	0	2
SUM	2	5.7	1	2.9	17	48.6	15	42.9	35
L 1	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	3
L 2	0	0	0	0	4	44.4	5	55.6	9
SUM	2	16.7	0	0	5	41.7	5	41.7	12
TOTAL	27	26.2	3	2.9	48	46.6	25	24.3	103

Rank Order Association with Damage

Principal or Teacher, and Open Door	-.57

TABLE 19 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
EVALUATION OF PUPIL ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL

Percent of Teachers

	Enthusiastic		Respect		Casual		Indifferent		Hate		Teacher
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	1	5.0	1	5.0	0	0	17	85.0	1	5.0	20
H 2	4	16.0	8	32.0	7	28.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	25
SUM	5	11.1	9	20.0	7	15.6	22	48.9	2	4.4	45
MH 1	1	4.0	1	4.0	8	32.0	15	60.0	0	0	25
MH 2	1	7.7	2	15.4	2	15.4	7	53.8	1	7.7	13
MH 3	3	12.5	9	37.5	5	20.8	6	25.0	1	4.2	24
MH 4	2	22.2	2	22.2	3	33.3	2	22.2	0	0	9
MH 5	8	25.8	9	29.1	8	25.8	6	19.4	0	0	31
SUM	15	14.7	23	22.5	26	25.5	36	35.3	2	2.0	102
M 1	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	42.9	1	14.3	0	0	8
M 2	15	53.6	4	14.3	6	21.4	2	7.1	1	3.6	28
M 3	5	33.3	8	53.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0	15
M 4	4	23.5	11	64.7	2	11.8	0	0	0	0	17
SUM	25	36.8	25	36.8	13	19.1	4	5.9	1	1.5	68
ML 1	17	48.6	13	37.1	5	14.3	0	0	0	0	35
ML 2	8	29.6	14	51.9	4	14.8	1	3.7	0	0	27
ML 3	0	0	1	20.0	0	0	4	80.0	0	0	5
SUM	25	37.3	28	41.8	9	13.4	5	7.5	0	0	67
L 1	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	9.1	5	45.5	2	18.2	11
L 2	11	84.7	2	15.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
SUM	12	50.0	4	16.7	1	4.2	5	20.8	2	8.3	24
TOTAL	82	26.7	89	29.1	56	18.3	72	23.5	7	2.3	306

Rank Order Association with Damage

Casual and Indifferent	.41
Enthused and Respect	-.37

enthused or respectful attitude toward the school was negative, -.37. Thus in high damage schools the teachers tended to feel that their students were casual or indifferent toward the school, while in low damage schools the teachers tended to feel that the students respected the school or were enthused over it.

Type of administration. Fewer than half of the teachers provided responses to this item. Slightly more than half of the responses indicated the principal to be strong, democratic and strict; the remainder of the responses indicated that the principal was casual or weak in his administration. Of the 71 responses that the principal was casual or weak in his administration, 53 or 75% were obtained in high or moderately high damage schools. The correlation of -.50 between high damage rank and the proportion of teachers reporting a rigid or strong and democratic principal, indicated in Table 20, suggests that teachers in low damage schools characterize their principal as strict, even rigid, but strong and democratic. The converse is true of high damage schools.

Teacher attitude toward the school. Each interview was analyzed on an overall basis for the teacher's attitude toward the school. In Table 21 it may be seen that slightly more than 50% of the teachers seemed to be enthused or constructively critical toward the school. Only 42 or 11.4% of the total number of teachers were judged to show a destructively critical attitude toward the school. Thirty, or 71% of these were in high or moderately high damage schools. A correlation of -.58 was found between damage rank and rank on percent of teachers expressing enthusiasm for their school. That is, the lower the damage rank, the more frequent the expression of enthusiasm for the school. A positive but limited correlation of .47 was found between high frequency of interviews judged as indicating a casual or constructively critical attitude on the part of the teacher, and high damage ranking.

Role of the teacher. When asked to give his conception of his role in the classroom, the teachers gave a variety of answers. Some indicated that they were there to teach, some to act as guides for the children, some to make good

TABLE 20 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
TYPE OF ADMINISTRATION

Percent of Responses

	Rigid		Democratic		Casual		Weak		Responses	Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.
H 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100.0	11	11
H 2	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	----	----
SUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	100.0	11	11
MH 1	0	0	2	8.0	5	20.0	18	72.0	25	24
MH 2	4	28.6	0	0	0	0	10	71.5	14	9
MH 3	0	0	8	57.1	4	28.6	2	14.3	14	14
MH 4	0	0	0	0	2	100.0	0	0	2	2
MH 5	2	20.0	7	70.0	0	0	1	10.0	10	10
SUM	6	9.2	17	26.2	11	16.9	31	47.7	65	59
M 1	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0	0	0	4	4
M 2	2	15.4	11	84.6	0	0	0	0	13	13
M 3	0	0	3	100.0	0	0	0	0	3	3
M 4	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0	0	0	2	2
SUM	4	18.2	18	81.8	0	0	0	0	22	22
ML 1	1	4.4	10	43.5	11	47.8	1	4.4	23	23
ML 2	2	11.8	15	88.2	0	0	0	0	17	17
ML 3	4	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
SUM	7	15.9	25	56.8	11	25.0	1	2.3	44	44
L 1	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	5	83.3	6	6
L 2	1	12.5	7	87.5	0	0	0	0	8	8
SUM	1	7.1	7	50.0	1	7.1	5	35.7	14	14
TOTAL	18	11.3	67	42.1	23	14.5	48	30.1	156	150

Rank Order Association with Damage

Rigid and Democratic	-.50

TABLE 21 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
TEACHER ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SCHOOL

Percent of Teachers

	Enthused		Constr. Critical		Casual		Destruct. Critical		Teachers
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	0	0	9	45.0	5	25.0	6	30.0	20
H 2	1	3.5	13	44.8	11	37.9	4	13.8	29
SUM	1	2.0	22	44.9	16	32.7	10	20.4	49
MH 1	2	8.0	9	36.0	9	36.0	5	20.0	25
MH 2	0	0	6	42.9	3	21.4	5	35.7	14
MH 3	6	19.4	12	38.7	9	29.0	4	12.9	31
MH 4	0	0	5	31.3	10	62.5	1	6.3	16
MH 5	11	25.6	10	23.8	17	39.5	5	11.6	43
SUM	19	14.7	42	32.6	48	37.2	20	15.5	129
M 1	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5	0	0	8
M 2	16	42.3	4	10.8	15	40.5	2	5.4	37
M 3	10	62.5	0	0	5	31.3	1	6.3	16
M 4	5	27.8	3	16.7	10	55.6	0	0	18
SUM	33	41.8	8	10.1	35	44.3	3	3.8	79
ML 1	12	33.3	13	36.1	10	27.9	1	2.8	36
ML 2	15	46.9	5	15.6	11	34.4	1	3.1	32
ML 3	4	36.4	1	9.1	5	45.5	1	9.1	11
SUM	31	39.2	19	24.1	26	32.9	3	3.8	79
L 1	1	6.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	6	40.0	15
L 2	7	43.8	3	18.8	6	37.5	0	0	16
SUM	8	25.8	8	25.8	9	29.0	6	19.4	31
TOTAL	92	25.1	99	27.0	134	36.4	42	11.4	367

Rank Order Association with Damage

Enthused	-.58
Constructively Critical and Casual	.47
Casual and Destructively Critical	.29

TABLE 22 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
ROLE OF TEACHER

Percent of Responses

School	Teach No.	Teach %	Guide No.	Guide %	Citizenship No.	Citizenship %	Parent No.	Parent %	Misc. No.	Misc. %	Responses No.	Teachers No.
H 1	17	35.4	14	29.2	7	14.6	10	20.8	0	0	48	20
H 2	25	45.5	16	29.1	11	20.0	1	1.9	2	3.6	55	29
SUM	42	40.8	30	29.1	18	17.5	11	10.7	2	1.9	103	49
MH 1	25	42.4	16	27.1	13	22.0	3	5.1	2	3.4	59	25
MH 2	11	36.7	9	30.0	8	26.7	0	0	2	6.7	30	14
MH 3	30	41.1	22	30.1	15	20.5	5	6.8	1	1.4	73	31
MH 4	14	37.8	12	32.4	5	13.5	5	13.5	1	2.7	37	16
MH 5	37	37.4	26	26.3	20	20.2	6	6.0	1	1.1	90	41
SUM	117	40.5	85	29.4	61	21.1	19	6.6	7	2.4	289	127
M 1	5	27.8	4	22.2	7	38.9	2	11.2	0	0	18	7
M 2	30	37.5	26	32.5	16	20.0	7	8.8	1	1.3	80	37
M 3	16	41.0	11	28.2	8	20.5	4	10.3	0	0	39	16
M 4	15	34.1	13	29.5	8	18.2	7	15.9	1	2.3	44	18
SUM	66	36.5	54	29.8	39	21.5	20	11.0	2	1.1	181	78
ML 1	36	43.9	20	24.4	19	23.2	5	6.1	2	2.4	82	36
ML 2	30	44.8	16	23.9	17	25.4	1	1.5	3	4.5	67	32
ML 3	10	43.5	7	30.4	3	13.0	2	8.8	1	4.4	23	11
SUM	76	44.2	43	25.0	39	22.7	8	4.7	6	3.5	172	79
L 1	11	34.4	10	31.3	7	21.9	3	9.4	1	3.1	32	15
L 2	15	50.0	6	20.0	5	16.7	3	10.0	1	3.3	30	15
SUM	26	41.9	16	25.8	12	19.4	6	9.7	2	3.2	62	30
TOTAL	327	40.5	228	28.2	169	20.9	64	7.9	19	2.4	807	363

Rank Order Correlation with Damage

Guide and Parent Substitute	.22
Teach	-.17
Teach and Citizenship	-.18
Citizenship	-.14

citizens, some to serve as parent substitutes. The teachers gave better than two replies each to this question. However, as may be seen in Table 22, there seems to be no statistically significant association between the percentage of teachers in a school who conceive of their role in a particular way, and high damage rank of the school.

Summary. Although almost every teacher was concerned about property damage by children, most of them expressed only mild or limited concern. Over two-thirds were aware of the extent and location of the problem in their own schools. A variety of reasons were presented by the teachers for school damage, with about one-third of the responses referring to inadequate home training. The teachers felt, on the whole, that an act of damage should not be ignored, and that disciplinary or other action should come from the principal or teacher rather than the police. There seemed to be agreement on the handling of cases of vandalism -- 70% of the responses prescribed that the offending child should either repair the damage or pay for the damage out of his own earnings.

Teachers in the high damage schools seemed to be quite concerned about vandalism, but with a somewhat lower awareness of the extent and nature of the problem than teachers in low damage schools. In high damage schools teachers tended to emphasize damage to classrooms, and to refer to the physical aspects of the school plant and to the administration of the school system as factors in the high damage rate in a school. Motivations attributed to children who damage school property were boredom, disinterest in school, and peer group pressure. There was a suggestion by teachers in high damage schools that the home training, sex, age, and grade of the child are significant factors in vandalism. Teachers in these schools seem to have had little contact with parents of their students, and interpret the parents' attitude toward the school as one of indifference. Schools were considered to vary in amount of damage because of the age and location of the building. Classrooms were thought to differ in damage because of the discipline exercised by the teacher. There was a slight tendency for action, in cases of property damage, to be delegated to the principal rather than the teacher. Contacts between teachers in these schools were more limited than in low damage schools, and tended to be more formal and professional in nature. Principal-teacher contacts also tended to be formal, and were usually initiated by the principal. The administration in the school was interpreted as weak and casual, and the student attitude toward the school as casual or indifferent. The attitude of teachers in the high damage school, as evaluated from the total interview, was one of casualness, or of constructive criticism. The teachers' role-conceptions were varied, and showed no patterned differences in high and low damage schools.

Analysis of the interview data indicated that although teachers in low damage schools showed a lesser concern with the problem of vandalism than did their colleagues in high damage schools, they had a greater awareness of the extent and nature of the problem in their own schools. They tended to emphasize more frequently damage outside classroom areas, and made slightly more references to damage in their own rooms. They tended to blame the school staff for a high rate of damage in a school. It was reported that children committed acts of damage for "fun" or for revenge, and suggested that such children were distinguished from others in terms of race, socio-economic class, and ability. Teachers tended, in low damage schools, to be more familiar with the parents than those in high damage schools, and interpreted the parents' interest in the school as strong. Differences in damage rates between schools were attributed to the characteristics of the students; differences in damage to classrooms were ascribed to the age and experience of the teacher. There was a slight suggestion that the teacher, rather than the principal, should handle the problem in the classroom. Contacts between teachers seemed to be less formal than in high damage schools, with frequent referrences to unplanned, informal social gatherings in the school and in the homes of teachers. Contacts with the principal, also, were less formal, being initiated either by the principal or the teacher, or stimulated by the "open door" policy of the former. The administration of the school was characterized as strong, democratic although sometimes rigid. Teachers and students were described as being enthused or proud of the school, with the students holding it in respect.

The Student Questionnaire.

A questionnaire was administered to a group of 1170 students in the sixteen schools being studied. The purpose of this step was to obtain from the students, as in the case of the teachers, information on their knowledge of vandalism in the school, their interpersonal relations with teachers, principal, counsellor, custodian, and other students, and some evaluation of the parents' attitudes toward the school. This would provide another perspective on the problem, from the point of view of the student -- the population from which the actors in vandalism are drawn. As in the analysis of the teacher interviews, the school, or schools grouped in a damage category, would constitute the unit of study or comparison.

The questionnaire, which may be found in Appendix D, was constructed by the project staff on the basis of the preliminary discussions with school teachers and administrators, the pilot study mentioned above, and with the advice of the advisory committee of principals which had been working with us. The student was given a choice of five responses to each question, the choices being arranged on what was presumed to be a scale from high to low. This five point ranking became automatically the coding scheme for use on the I.B.M. cards.

The student sample consisted of between 8% and 15% of the junior and senior high pupils in each school. The 1170 students who were questioned, constituted 11% of the total senior and junior high school population of our sixteen schools. In order to avoid, insofar as possible, obtaining a selected group we requested that students be drawn from required courses such as English, Citizenship, and General Science. Some students were taken from study halls which presumably would contain a cross section of the student population. The students ranged in age from twelve to eighteen, with only about 25% above 15. The proportion of boys and girls was about equal. Since, in the opinion of many of the educators we contacted, the eighth and tenth school years were the most crucial in terms of school adjustment, we decided to use for the most part students in these years. However, a few ninth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students were included, usually because of scheduling problems in the school. About half of the total 1170 students were in the eighth grade; about 35% were in the tenth grade. However, the various school grades were not randomly distributed among the five damage classes. These data may be seen in Table 23.

The Questionnaires were administered to the students either in the cafeteria, the auditorium, or in a study hall. In all cases there were a sufficient number of project personnel present to aid students in interpreting questions which were not understood by the individual, and to see that directions were followed. The purpose of the study was explained to the students, and their cooperation requested. In all schools the principal or assistant principal cooperated in setting up the meeting, and in requesting the cooperation of the students. The students were informed that participation in the study was entirely voluntary, that the student did not have to answer the questionnaire. Also, they were assured of anonymity. No names were to be put on the paper. The staff felt that student copperation was excellent.

Analysis of the Questionnaire Data.

As in the case of the teacher interviews, it must be remembered that these results cannot be taken as representative of the responses of all students in the Syracuse schools. They represent only a sample of the sixteen schools which teach at the junior or senior high levels. Moreover, within each school we had to rely on those students who could be conveniently collected at a time satisfactory to the Project staff and the faculty of the school. Again, it is emphasized that the unit of study in this research was the school or group of schools in a given damage category. The questionnaire data will be discussed question by question, and will be presented in Tables 24 to 45.

TABLE 23 SEX, AGE AND GRADE OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS

DAMAGE GROUP

	High		M. High		Moderate		M. Low		Low		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Sex												
Boy	78	45.6	182	49.7	108	56.8	139	48.9	79	49.7	586	50.1
Girl	93	54.4	184	50.3	82	43.2	145	51.1	80	50.3	584	49.9
SUM	171	14.6	366	31.3	190	16.2	284	24.3	159	13.6	1170	
Grade												
8	28	16.4	256	69.9	46	24.2	209	73.6	44	27.8	583	49.9
9	1	0.6	0	0	3	1.6	25	8.8	0	0	29	2.5
10	103	60.2	100	27.3	91	47.9	50	17.6	59	37.3	403	34.5
11	36	21.1	10	2.7	48	25.3	0	0	16	10.1	110	9.4
12	3	1.8	0	0	2	1.1	0	0	39	24.7	44	3.8
SUM	171	14.6	366	31.3	190	16.3	284	24.3	158	13.5	1169	
Age												
12	0	0	12	3.3	4	2.1	4	1.4	3	1.9	23	2.0
13	15	8.8	151	41.4	19	10.0	128	45.1	24	15.1	337	28.8
14	18	10.5	52	14.2	14	7.4	70	24.6	11	6.9	165	14.1
15	70	40.9	90	24.7	60	31.6	62	21.8	52	32.7	334	28.6
16	51	29.8	51	14.0	66	34.7	19	6.7	29	18.2	216	18.5
17	12	7.0	8	2.2	15	7.9	1	0.4	32	20.1	68	5.8
18	5	2.9	1	0.3	12	6.3	0	0	8	5.0	26	2.2
SUM	171	14.6	365	31.2	190	16.3	284	24.3	159	13.6	1169	

A. Why do you attend school? Only 14.5% of the students reported that they attended school because it was compulsory, or that the parents demanded it, or because the child had "nothing else to do". The obtained rank order correlation of .13; however, indicates the association of frequency of such responses with damage rank was negligible. Some limited association was found between a high proportion of students reporting school attendance for the purpose of obtaining a job, and school damage rank. A negative, although low, correlation (-.37) was obtained between school rank on rate of students reporting preparation for college and rank on the damage scale. In other words, high damage in schools appears somewhat related to a high proportion of students attending school ih preparation for a job; low damage seems slightly associated with a high proportion of students preparing for college.

B. How does your school compare with other schools? Slightly more than half the students replied that their school was "equal to" other schools. Only 12.5% reported that their school was poorer than most, or the poorest in the city. A rank order association of .48 was found between the percentage of "poorer" or "poorest" reports, and high damage rank. On the other hand, a negative but lower association was found between damage rank and percent of students who reported their school to be the best, or better than most, in the city. High damage seems to have a limited but positive association with a high proportion of students who have a low evaluation of the school; low damage, it is suggested by our data, is associated with children who hold their school in high esteem.

C. How do you get along with other pupils in your school? This question did not prove to discriminate between high and low damage schools. Ninety-six per cent of the replies were to the effect that student relations were cordial or friendly. The rank order correlation of .28 between high damage and getting along with classmates suggestsa very low, but positive association between these variables.

TABLE 24 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
A. WHY DO YOU ATTEND SCHOOL?

	Compulsory		Idle		Parents		Job		College		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	2	2.3	0	0	9	10.5	43	50.0	32	37.2	86
H 2	0	0	2	2.4	4	4.7	38	44.7	41	48.2	85
SUM	2	1.2	2	1.2	13	7.6	81	47.4	73	42.7	171
MH 1	4	3.6	0	0	16	14.6	43	39.1	47	42.7	110
MH 2	3	10.7	1	3.6	5	17.9	6	21.4	13	46.4	28
MH 3	5	5.7	3	3.6	12	14.3	23	27.4	41	48.8	84
MH 4	1	2.2	3	6.5	5	10.9	12	26.1	25	54.4	46
MH 5	3	2.6	1	0.9	13	11.3	44	38.3	54	46.9	115
SUM	16	4.2	8	2.1	51	13.3	128	33.4	180	47.0	383
M 1	0	0	0	0	2	9.5	6	28.6	13	61.9	21
M 2	9	9.2	2	2.0	9	9.2	44	44.9	34	34.7	98
M 3	1	3.5	0	0	0	0	7	24.1	21	72.4	29
M 4	4	16.0	1	4.0	6	24.0	6	24.0	8	32.0	25
SUM	14	8.1	3	1.7	17	9.8	63	36.4	76	43.9	173
ML 1	2	1.8	2	1.8	13	11.5	32	28.3	64	56.6	113
ML 2	1	0.7	1	0.7	4	2.9	17	12.4	114	83.2	137
ML 3	4	11.8	0	0	8	23.5	11	32.4	11	32.4	34
SUM	7	2.5	3	1.1	25	8.8	60	21.1	189	66.5	284
L 1	3	6.8	1	2.3	1	2.3	10	22.7	29	65.9	44
L 2	0	0	0	0	3	2.6	15	13.0	97	84.4	115
SUM	3	1.9	1	0.6	4	2.5	25	15.7	126	79.2	159
TOTAL	42	3.6	17	1.5	110	9.4	357	30.5	644	55.0	1170

Rank Order Association with Damage

Job	.49	**Idle & Parents**	.17
College	-.37	**Compulsory, Idle & Parents**	.13

TABLE 25 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
B. HOW DOES YOUR SCHOOL COMPARE WITH OTHER SCHOOLS?

	Best		Better		"All Right"		Poorer		Poorest		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	3	3.5	6	7.0	62	72.1	15	17.4	0	0	86
H 2	3	3.5	20	23.5	52	61.2	9	10.6	1	1.2	85
SUM	6	3.5	26	15.2	114	66.7	24	14.0	1	0.6	171
MH 1	8	7.3	14	12.7	61	55.5	20	18.2	7	6.4	110
MH 2	0	0	1	3.6	14	50.0	10	35.7	3	10.7	28
MH 3	2	2.8	9	10.8	59	71.1	8	9.6	5	6.1	83
MH 4	1	2.2	3	6.5	33	71.8	5	10.9	4	8.7	46
MH 5	7	6.1	24	20.9	67	58.3	10	8.8	7	6.1	115
SUM	18	4.7	51	13.4	234	61.3	53	13.9	26	6.8	382
M 1	1	4.8	1	4.8	15	71.4	3	14.3	1	4.8	21
M 2	4	4.1	25	25.5	61	62.2	3	3.1	5	5.1	98
M 3	12	41.4	12	41.4	5	17.2	0	0	0	0	29
M 4	1	4.0	0	0	16	64.0	6	24.0	2	8.0	25
SUM	18	10.4	38	22.0	97	56.1	12	6.9	8	4.6	173
ML 1	20	17.7	45	39.8	44	38.9	4	3.5	0	0	113
ML 2	9	6.6	55	40.4	62	45.6	6	4.4	4	2.9	136
ML 3	0	0	9	26.5	20	58.8	3	8.8	2	5.9	34
SUM	29	10.2	109	38.5	126	44.5	13	4.6	6	2.1	283
L 1	0	0	10	22.7	32	72.7	1	2.3	1	2.3	44
L 2	24	20.9	72	62.6	18	15.7	1	0.9	0	0	115
SUM	24	15.1	82	51.6	50	31.4	2	1.3	1	0.6	159
TOTAL	95	8.1	306	26.2	621	53.2	104	8.9	42	3.6	1168

Rank Order Association with Damage

Poorer & Poorest .48 Best & Better -.37

"Allright" .28

TABLE 26 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
C. HOW DO YOU GET ALONG WITH THE OTHER PUPILS IN YOUR SCHOOL?

	Cordial		Friendly		Indifferent		Unfriendly		Malicious		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	70	81.4	16	18.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
H 2	63	74.1	21	24.7	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	85
SUM	133	77.8	37	21.6	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	171
MH 1	83	75.5	21	19.1	2	1.8	4	3.6	0	0	110
MH 2	18	64.3	9	32.1	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	28
MH 3	62	73.8	17	20.2	1	1.2	1	1.2	3	3.6	84
MH 4	36	78.3	9	19.6	1	2.2	0	0	0	0	46
MH 5	88	76.5	25	21.7	0	0	1	0.9	1	0.9	115
SUM	287	74.9	81	21.1	5	1.3	6	1.6	4	1.0	383
M 1	19	90.5	2	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
M 2	68	69.4	25	25.5	1	1.0	1	1.0	3	3.0	98
M 3	25	86.2	4	13.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
M 4	10	40.0	12	48.0	0	0	2	8.0	1	4.0	25
SUM	122	70.5	43	24.9	1	0.6	3	1.7	4	2.3	173
ML 1	95	84.1	13	11.5	4	3.5	1	0.8	0	0	113
ML 2	99	72.8	29	21.3	6	4.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	136
ML 3	24	70.6	10	29.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
SUM	218	77.0	52	18.4	10	3.5	2	0.7	1	0.4	283
L 1	34	77.3	8	18.2	1	2.3	0	0	1	2.3	44
L 2	84	73.0	23	20.0	4	3.5	4	3.5	0	0	115
SUM	118	74.2	31	19.5	5	3.1	4	2.5	1	0.6	159
TOTAL	878	75.1	244	20.9	22	1.9	15	1.3	10	0.9	1169

Rank Order Association with Damage

Cordial & Friendly .28

D. How do you and your friends feel about your school? Approximately 90% of the students reported being proud of the school, or that it was "O.K." and that they respected it. Only 9% reported that they were either bored with or actively hated school. There appears to be no association, however, between student feeling toward the school, and damage rating of the school. The correlations in Table 27, although in the expected direction -- that is, high damage associated with low esteem -- are too small to be considered significant.

E. What do you do when you hear people criticize or say bad things about your school? More than half the students reported that they would defend the school against criticism. Twenty-two per cent would go along with the critic to the extent of agreeing with him or adding to the criticism. The size of the obtained rank order correlations indicated in Table 28,however, does not indicate any association between student reaction to criticism and school rank on damage.

F. When you hear people talk about school loyalty, what do you think it means? Over two-thirds of the students replied that loyalty to them meant being faithful to school personnel or being true to school traditions. There appears, however, to be little association between frequency of such responses and damage rank of a school. There was a suggestive relation between a high proportion of students in a school who define loyalty as attending or participating in activities, and a high rate of school damage. On the other hand, there was a similar degree of association between low damage and high proportion of students who responded that loyalty meant "doing something for the school".

G. Do the pupils work to make your school better? Only 11% of the reports indicated that students did not try to better the school or that they actively harmed the school. Most of the students aided when requested, or did so occassionally. A correlation of .33 was obtained between proportions of reports that students either did nothing to improve the school, or actively worked to harm it, and damage rank of schools. On the other hand a negative, although very low, association was found between high damage and high frequency of reports that the students actively sought for ways to improve the school. The data suggest, therefore, an association, although of a very low order, between school damage rank and a relatively high proportion of students with an unfavorable attitude toward the school.

TABLE 27 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
D. HOW DO YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS FEEL ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL?

	Enthused		Proud		"All Right"		Bored		Hate		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	5	5.8	32	37.2	42	48.8	2	2.3	5	5.8	86
H 2	9	10.6	39	45.9	31	36.5	4	4.7	2	2.2	85
SUM	14	8.2	71	41.5	73	42.7	6	3.5	7	4.1	171
MH 1	8	7.3	30	27.3	62	56.4	5	4.6	5	4.6	110
MH 2	0	0	4	14.3	21	75.0	3	10.7	0	0	28
MH 3	3	3.6	25	30.1	47	56.6	3	3.6	5	6.0	83
MH 4	0	0	9	19.6	33	71.7	4	8.7	0	0	46
MH 5	6	5.3	52	45.6	44	38.6	9	7.9	3	2.6	114
SUM	17	4.5	120	31.5	207	54.3	24	6.3	13	3.4	381
M 1	1	4.8	7	33.3	10	47.6	3	14.3	0	0	21
M 2	6	6.1	34	34.7	40	40.8	6	6.0	12	12.2	98
M 3	7	24.1	20	69.0	2	6.9	0	00	0	0	29
M 4	2	8.0	2	8.0	13	52.0	3	12.0	5	20.0	25
SUM	16	9.2	63	36.4	65	37.6	12	6.9	17	9.8	173
ML 1	16	14.1	67	59.3	24	21.2	5	4.4	1	0.9	113
ML 2	7	5.1	63	46.0	60	43.8	5	3.7	2	1.5	137
ML 3	1	2.9	13	38.2	16	47.1	0	0	4	11.8	34
SUM	24	8.5	143	50.4	100	35.2	10	3.5	7	2.5	284
L 1	2	4.6	14	31.8	24	54.5	3	6.8	1	2.3	44
L 2	17	14.8	69	60.0	23	20.0	5	4.4	1	0.9	115
SUM	19	11.9	83	52.2	47	29.6	8	5.0	2	1.3	159
TOTAL	90	7.7	480	41.1	492	42.1	60	5.1	46	3.9	1168

Rank Order Association with Damage

Proud	-.25	**Enthused & Proud**	-.23
"Allright"	.27	**Bored & Hate**	.00

TABLE 28 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
E. WHAT DO YOU DO WHEN YOU HEAR PEOPLE CRITICIZE YOUR SCHOOL?

	Resent		Defend		Do Nothing		Agree		Amplify		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	7	8.1	54	62.8	6	7.0	4	4.7	15	17.4	86
H 2	8	9.4	59	69.4	4	4.7	3	3.5	11	12.9	85
SUM	15	8.7	113	66.1	10	5.8	7	4.1	26	15.2	171
MH 1	3	2.7	76	69.1	9	8.2	12	10.9	10	9.1	110
MH 2	3	10.7	8	28.6	7	25.0	3	10.7	7	25.0	28
MH 3	7	8.3	45	53.6	14	16.7	11	13.1	7	8.3	84
MH 4	1	2.2	18	39.1	11	23.9	8	17.4	8	17.4	46
MH 5	3	2.6	68	59.1	12	10.4	11	9.6	21	18.3	115
SUM	17	4.4	215	56.1	53	13.8	45	11.7	53	13.8	383
M 1	0	0	12	57.1	5	23.8	2	9.5	2	9.5	21
M 2	14	14.3	43	43.9	13	13.3	10	10.2	18	18.4	98
M 3	4	13.8	21	72.4	3	10.3	0	0	1	3.5	29
M 4	2	8.0	3	12.0	6	24.0	7	28.0	7	28.0	25
SUM	20	11.6	79	45.7	27	15.6	19	11.0	28	16.2	173
ML 1	14	12.4	77	68.1	14	12.4	3	2.7	5	4.4	113
ML 2	4	2.9	78	56.9	30	21.9	7	5.1	18	13.1	137
ML 3	6	17.7	13	38.2	4	11.8	3	8.8	8	23.5	34
SUM	24	8.5	168	59.2	48	16.9	13	4.6	31	10.9	284
L 1	0	0	22	50.0	7	15.9	5	11.4	10	22.7	44
L 2	6	5.2	73	63.5	16	13.9	4	3.5	16	13.9	115
SUM	6	3.8	95	59.7	23	14.5	9	5.7	26	16.4	159
TOTAL	82	7.0	670	57.3	161	13.8	93	8.0	164	14.0	1170

Rank Order Association with Damage

Do Nothing -.25 Resent & Defend .18

TABLE 29 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
F. WHEN YOU HEAR PEOPLE TALK ABOUT SCHOOL LOYALTY, WHAT DO YOU THINK IT MEANS?

	Deeds		Participation		Academic		Persons		Traditions		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	6	7.1	21	24.7	0	0	23	27.1	35	41.2	85
H 2	17	20.0	18	21.2	1	1.2	14	16.5	35	41.2	85
SUM	23	13.5	39	22.9	1	0.6	37	21.8	70	41.2	170
MH 1	12	11.0	24	22.0	2	1.8	23	21.1	48	44.0	109
MH 2	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0	17	60.7	9	32.1	28
MH 3	10	11.9	13	15.5	5	6.0	28	33.3	28	33.3	84
MH 4	1	2.2	7	15.2	1	2.2	13	28.3	24	52.2	46
MH 5	15	13.0	24	20.9	0	0	12	10.4	64	55.7	115
SUM	39	10.2	69	18.1	8	2.1	93	24.3	173	45.3	382
M 1	3	14.3	4	19.1	2	9.5	5	23.8	7	33.3	21
M 2	13	13.3	9	9.2	5	5.1	41	41.8	30	30.6	98
M 3	4	13.8	3	10.3	0	0	7	24.1	15	51.7	29
M 4	2	8.0	7	28.0	2	8.0	9	36.0	5	20.0	25
SUM	22	12.7	23	13.3	9	5.2	62	35.8	57	32.9	173
ML 1	12	10.6	21	18.6	5	4.4	30	26.6	45	39.8	113
ML 2	14	10.5	27	20.3	0	0	26	19.6	66	49.6	133
ML 3	6	17.7	2	5.9	0	0	11	32.4	15	44.1	34
SUM	32	11.4	50	17.9	5	1.8	67	23.9	126	45.0	280
L 1	8	18.2	4	9.1	2	4.6	9	20.5	21	47.7	44
L 2	29	25.2	14	12.2	2	1.7	27	23.5	43	37.4	115
SUM	37	23.3	18	11.3	4	2.5	36	22.6	64	40.3	159
TOTAL	153	13.1	199	17.1	27	2.3	295	25.3	490	42.1	1164

Rank Order Association with Damage

Deeds	-.38	Participation	.37
Persons & Traditions	.03		

TABLE 30 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
G. DO THE PUPILS WORK TO MAKE YOUR SCHOOL BETTER?

	Actively		Occasionally		When Asked		Never		Harm		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	18	20.9	28	32.6	28	32.6	2	2.3	10	11.6	86
H 2	23	27.1	24	28.2	31	36.5	5	5.9	2	2.4	85
SUM	41	24.0	52	30.4	59	34.5	7	4.1	12	7.0	171
MH 1	19	17.3	34	30.9	36	32.7	9	8.2	12	10.9	110
MH 2	0	0	11	39.3	8	28.6	1	3.6	8	28.6	28
MH 3	17	20.5	23	27.7	28	33.4	2	2.4	13	15.7	83
MH 4	7	15.2	15	32.6	19	41.3	1	2.2	4	8.7	46
MH 5	37	32.5	31	27.2	41	35.9	1	0.9	4	3.5	114
SUM	80	21.0	114	29.9	132	34.6	14	3.7	41	10.8	381
M 1	4	19.1	5	23.8	9	42.9	0	0	3	14.3	21
M 2	9	9.2	27	27.6	34	34.7	10	10.2	18	18.4	98
M 3	10	34.5	14	48.3	4	13.8	1	3.5	0	0	29
M 4	5	20.0	3	12.0	14	56.0	0	0	3	12.0	25
SUM	28	16.2	49	28.3	61	35.3	11	6.4	24	13.9	173
ML 1	32	28.6	37	33.0	39	34.8	2	1.8	2	1.8	112
ML 2	59	43.1	34	24.8	37	27.0	3	2.2	4	2.9	137
ML 3	6	17.7	10	29.4	13	38.2	3	8.8	2	5.9	34
SUM	97	34.3	81	28.6	89	31.4	8	2.8	8	2.8	283
L 1	3	6.8	12	27.3	27	61.4	0	0	2	4.6	44
L 2	68	59.1	27	23.5	19	16.5	1	0.9	0	0	115
SUM	71	44.7	39	24.5	46	28.9	1	0.6	2	1.3	159
TOTAL	317	27.2	335	28.7	387	33.2	41	3.5	87	7.5	1167

Rank Order Association with Damage

Never & Harm	**.33**	**Occasionally & When Asked**	**-.02**
Actively	**-.11**		

H. How do your parents feel about your school? There appears to be a moderately strong association, as shown in Table 31 between low damage and reports that the parents were enthused or held a favorable attitude toward the school. About 60% of the students reported such attitudes on the part of their parents. A rank order association of -.57 was obtained between a favorable parent attitude toward the school and high damage rank. High damage, thus, appears associated with unfavorable and critical attitudes on the part of parents. A high proportion of parents who were non-committal about their attitude toward the school was similarly, although to a slightly lower degree, associated with high damage rank.

I. Do you think your parents are interested in the school? Less than 20% of the students felt that their parents were either indifferent, disinterested, or rejecting toward the school. The association between damage rank and attitude of parents,indicated in Table 32,is statistically too low to be considered significant. However, it should be noted that high damage is positively associated with unfavorable parental attitude, and negatively associated with favorable parental attitudes toward the school.

J. Do you feel that the students are allowed a part in planning school programs? About half the responses indicated that students met regularly with the principal to plan school programs, or initiated programs with the principal's approval. Thirteen and three tenths percent of the respondents indicated that in their school students were allowed no voice in school affairs. The rank order correlation of -.47 between high rank on damage and high rank on proportion of students reporting that they were allowed a regular and significant part in planning school affairs, indicates a fair degree of association between low damage and strong student participation in school planning. Low participation is positively associated with high damage.

K. What do you do about extra-curricular activities? Degree of participation of students in extra-curricular activities did not seem associated with damage rank of the school. Neither a high proportion of leaders nor of isolates seem associated with damage rank of the school. There is a slight suggestion of an association between rank in proportion of students reporting as "observer" in extra-curricular activities and high school damage rank.

TABLE 31 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
H. HOW DO YOUR PARENTS FEEL ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL?

	Enthused		Favorable		Non Committal		Unfavorable		Critical		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	7	8.1	30	34.9	32	37.2	9	10.5	8	9.3	86
H 2	6	7.1	39	45.9	22	25.9	11	12.9	7	8.2	85
SUM	13	7.6	69	40.4	54	31.6	20	11.7	15	8.8	171
MH 1	11	10.1	46	42.2	33	30.2	12	11.0	7	6.4	109
MH 2	1	3.6	11	39.3	9	32.1	5	17.9	2	7.1	28
MH 3	5	5.9	40	47.6	26	30.9	6	7.1	7	8.3	84
MH 4	1	2.2	18	39.1	19	41.3	6	13.0	2	4.4	46
MH 5	19	16.5	47	40.1	37	32.1	9	7.8	3	2.6	115
SUM	37	9.7	162	42.4	124	32.5	38	9.9	21	5.5	382
M 1	1	4.8	13	61.9	0	0	4	19.1	3	14.3	21
M 2	16	16.3	45	45.9	22	22.5	8	8.1	7	7.1	98
M 3	18	62.1	8	27.6	2	6.9	1	3.5	0	0	29
M 4	2	8.0	7	28.0	9	36.0	2	8.0	5	20.0	25
SUM	37	21.4	73	42.2	33	19.1	15	8.7	15	8.7	173
ML 1	28	24.8	56	49.6	15	13.3	9	7.9	5	4.4	113
ML 2	20	14.6	76	55.5	22	16.1	14	10.2	5	3.7	137
ML 3	2	5.9	17	50.0	10	29.4	3	8.8	2	5.9	34
SUM	50	17.6	149	52.5	47	16.5	26	9.2	12	4.2	284
L 1	1	2.2	29	65.9	12	27.3	2	4.6	0	0	44
L 2	45	39.1	41	35.7	21	18.3	5	4.4	3	2.6	115
SUM	46	28.9	70	44.0	33	20.8	7	4.4	3	1.9	159
TOTAL	183	15.7	523	44.7	291	25.0	106	9.1	66	5.7	1169

Rank Order Association with Damage

Enthused & Favorable	**-.57**	**Non Committal**	**.41**
Unfavorable & Critical	**.49**		

TABLE 32 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
I. DO YOU THINK YOUR PARENTS ARE INTERESTED IN THE SCHOOL?

	Keenly		Moderately		Indifferent		Disinterested		Rejecting		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	14	16.3	47	54.5	6	6.9	19	22.0	0	0	86
H 2	18	21.2	48	56.5	8	9.4	11	12.9	0	0	85
SUM	32	18.7	95	55.6	14	8.2	30	17.5	0	0	171
MH 1	15	13.8	75	68.8	8	7.3	11	10.1	0	0	109
MH 2	3	10.8	14	50.0	2	7.1	8	28.6	1	3.6	28
MH 3	21	25.0	44	52.4	4	4.8	13	15.5	2	2.4	84
MH 4	9	19.6	28	60.9	5	10.9	3	6.5	1	2.2	46
MH 5	18	15.7	65	56.5	15	13.0	16	13.9	1	0.9	115
SUM	66	17.3	226	59.2	34	8.9	51	13.4	5	1.3	382
M 1	3	14.3	16	76.2	1	4.8	1	4.8	0	0	21
M 2	35	35.8	49	50.0	5	5.1	8	8.2	1	1.0	98
M 3	5	17.2	20	68.9	1	3.5	3	10.3	0	0	29
M 4	3	12.0	11	44.0	1	4.0	9	36.0	1	4.0	25
SUM	46	26.6	96	55.5	8	4.6	21	12.1	2	1.2	173
ML 1	28	25.0	74	66.1	4	3.6	6	5.4	0	0	112
ML 2	48	35.0	72	52.6	5	3.7	10	7.3	2	1.5	137
ML 3	2	5.9	19	55.9	1	2.9	10	29.4	2	5.9	34
SUM	78	27.6	165	58.3	10	3.5	26	9.2	4	1.4	283
L 1	8	18.2	25	56.7	3	6.8	8	18.2	0	0	44
L 2	18	15.7	74	64.4	10	8.7	12	10.4	1	0.9	115
SUM	26	16.4	99	62.3	13	8.2	20	12.6	1	0.6	159
TOTAL	248	21.2	681	58.3	79	6.8	148	12.7	12	1.0	1168

Rank Order Association with Damage

Keenly & Moderately	-.25	**Disinterested & Reject**	.21

TABLE 33 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
J. ARE STUDENTS ALLOWED A PART IN PLANNING SCHOOL PROGRAMS?

	None		Occasionally		Frequently		Regularly		Initiate		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	9	10.5	18	20.9	11	12.8	3	3.5	45	52.3	86
H 2	11	12.9	27	31.8	9	10.6	3	3.5	35	41.2	85
SUM	20	11.7	45	26.3	20	11.7	6	3.5	80	46.8	171
MH 1	16	14.6	36	32.7	13	11.8	8	7.3	37	33.6	110
MH 2	7	25.9	8	29.6	5	18.5	2	7.4	5	18.6	27
MH 3	17	20.2	18	21.4	17	20.2	11	13.1	21	25.0	84
MH 4	8	17.4	12	26.1	7	15.2	0	0	19	41.3	46
MH 5	21	18.3	29	25.3	14	12.2	9	7.8	42	36.5	115
SUM	69	18.1	103	27.0	56	14.7	30	7.9	124	32.5	382
M 1	5	23.8	5	23.8	2	9.5	3	14.3	6	28.6	21
M 2	16	16.3	16	16.3	14	14.3	7	7.1	45	45.9	98
M 3	3	10.3	7	24.1	3	10.3	5	17.2	11	37.9	29
M 4	5	20.0	4	16.0	4	16.0	2	8.0	10	40.0	25
SUM	29	16.8	32	18.5	23	13.3	17	9.8	72	41.6	173
ML 1	7	6.2	20	17.7	19	16.8	8	7.1	59	52.2	113
ML 2	11	8.1	33	24.3	16	11.8	24	17.8	52	38.2	136
ML 3	6	17.7	7	20.6	4	11.8	0	0	17	50.0	34
SUM	24	8.5	60	21.2	39	13.8	32	11.3	128	45.2	283
L 1	7	15.9	8	18.2	8	18.2	5	11.4	16	36.4	44
L 2	6	5.2	25	21.7	11	9.6	9	7.8	64	55.7	115
SUM	13	8.2	33	20.8	19	11.9	14	8.8	80	50.3	159
TOTAL	155	13.3	273	23.4	157	13.4	99	8.5	484	41.4	1168

Rank Order Association with Damage

None .27 None and Occasionally .45

Regularly and Initiate -.47

TABLE 34 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
K. WHAT DO YOU DO ABOUT EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES?

	Leader		Participant		Observer		Non Participant		Lacking		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	6	7.0	27	31.4	31	36.0	19	22.1	3	3.5	86
H 2	9	10.7	47	55.9	21	25.0	7	8.3	0	0	84
SUM	15	8.8	74	43.5	52	30.6	26	15.3	3	1.8	170
MH 1	5	4.6	49	44.6	29	26.4	22	20.0	5	4.6	110
MH 2	3	10.7	15	53.6	7	25.0	3	10.7	0	0	28
MH 3	8	9.6	35	42.2	25	30.1	11	13.3	4	4.8	83
MH 4	2	4.4	33	71.7	5	10.9	4	8.7	2	4.4	46
MH 5	12	10.4	50	43.5	27	23.5	24	20.9	2	1.7	115
SUM	30	7.9	182	47.6	93	24.3	64	16.8	13	3.4	382
M 1	2	9.5	10	47.6	4	19.1	3	14.3	2	9.5	21
M 2	6	6.1	39	39.8	33	33.7	14	14.3	6	6.1	98
M 3	1	3.5	10	34.5	15	51.7	3	10.3	0	0	29
M 4	4	16.0	9	36.0	4	16.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	25
SUM	13	7.5	68	39.3	56	32.4	21	12.1	15	8.7	173
ML 1	14	12.4	59	52.2	33	29.2	7	6.2	0	0	113
ML 2	16	11.8	57	41.9	38	27.9	21	15.4	4	2.9	136
ML 3	1	2.9	15	44.1	5	14.7	5	14.7	8	23.5	34
SUM	31	11.0	131	46.3	76	26.9	33	11.7	12	4.2	283
L 1	9	20.5	19	43.2	14	31.8	1	2.3	1	2.3	44
L 2	11	9.6	58	50.4	31	26.9	15	13.0	0	0	115
SUM	20	12.6	77	48.4	45	28.3	16	10.1	1	0.6	159
TOTAL	109	9.3	532	45.6	322	27.6	160	13.7	44	3.8	1167

Rank Order Association with Damage

Observer	.25	**Isolate**	.22
Leader	-.16		

L. Why do some classrooms have more damage than others? The responses to this question revealed no association between damage rank and tendency for the pupils to blame either the class structure, the pupiles or the teacher for damage. The six choices of response on the questionnaire were checked with no particular pattern in high and in low damage schools

M. What should happen if a pupil damages property in a school? There appears to be no discrimination between responses of students in high and low damage schools regarding punishment for vandalism in the school. Restitution by the pupil was mentioned by 73.7% of all students as the penalty to be imposed. The very low rank order correlations suggest no association between damage rank and punitive attitude of students toward offenders.

N-R. Why do pupils damage school property? Students were asked to rank in order of importance five reasons given for damage. The frequency of first choices given each of the five reasons was computed for each school. "Boredom" was the only first choice response which has even a limited association with damage rank of the school. The other correlations are too low for us to accept as significant. It is of interest to note, however, that the responses "revenge" and "to belong" were negatively correlated with damage, while all the other correlations are positive. The ideas that acts of damage are committed for peer group status, or for the sake of revenge seem to be associated with low damage schools.

S. How do pupils feel about your principal? Over seventy per cent of the students indicated that they respected their principal, or that they greatly admired him. Only a small proportion, 10.6%, indicated that they felt he was lax and weak in his administration. However, these students seem to predominate in the high damage schools. A correlation of .40, of limited significance, was obtained between damage rank and proportion of students who reported their principal to be lax and weak in his administration of the school. A low but negative correlation was found between damage rank and rank on proportion of students who indicated respect and admiration for the principal. High damage seems to be related to the feeling by students that the principal is "too easy-going"; low damage appears associated, but to a limited extent, with feelings of respect and admiration for the principal on the part of students.

T. How do you feel about the counselors in your school? About three fourths of the student respondents indicated that the school counselor was interested in and helpful with student problems, academic and otherwise. The remainder felt that the counselor was only mildly interested in aiding students, or that the

TABLE 35 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
L. WHY DO SOME CLASSROOMS HAVE MORE DAMAGE THAN OTHERS?

	Class				Pupil				Teacher				
	Size		Subject		Type		Interest		Skill		Discipline		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	1	1.2	1	1.2	23	26.7	27	31.4	20	23.3	14	16.3	86
H 2	2	2.4	2	2.4	10	11.8	25	29.4	37	43.5	9	10.6	85
SUM	3	1.8	3	1.8	33	19.3	52	30.4	57	33.3	23	13.5	171
MH 1	3	2.7	2	1.8	23	20.9	13	11.8	53	48.2	16	14.6	110
MH 2	0	0	2	7.1	15	53.6	5	17.9	3	10.7	3	10.7	28
MH 3	3	3.6	2	2.4	33	39.3	23	27.4	12	14.3	11	13.1	84
MH 4	1	2.2	2	4.4	10	21.7	12	26.1	9	19.6	12	26.1	46
MH 5	9	7.8	5	4.4	19	16.5	35	30.4	33	28.7	14	12.2	115
SUM	16	4.2	13	3.4	100	26.1	88	23.0	110	28.7	56	14.6	383
M 1	0	0	0	0	5	25.0	7	35.0	7	35.0	1	5.0	20
M 2	3	3.1	10	10.2	34	34.7	14	14.3	26	26.5	11	11.2	98
M 3	2	6.9	1	3.5	10	34.5	5	17.2	11	37.9	0	0	29
M 4	0	0	0	0	7	28.0	5	20.0	7	28.0	6	24.0	25
SUM	5	2.9	11	6.4	56	32.6	31	18.0	51	29.7	18	10.5	172
ML 1	1	0.9	4	3.6	14	12.5	36	32.1	33	29.5	24	21.4	112
ML 2	2	1.5	8	5.9	35	25.7	40	29.4	41	30.2	10	7.4	136
ML 3	1	2.9	2	5.9	17	50.0	6	17.7	4	11.8	4	11.8	34
SUM	4	1.4	14	5.0	66	23.4	82	29.1	78	27.7	38	13.5	282
L 1	0	0	2	4.6	12	27.3	6	13.6	18	40.9	6	13.6	44
L 2	2	1.8	3	2.6	21	18.4	26	22.8	32	28.1	30	26.3	114
SUM	2	1.3	5	3.2	33	20.9	32	20.3	50	31.6	36	22.8	158
TOTAL	30	2.6	46	4.0	288	24.7	285	24.4	346	29.7	171	14.7	1166

Rank Order Association with Damage

Teacher Discipline	**-.13**	**Pupil Type & Interest**	**.10**
Class Size & Subject	**.00**	**Teacher Skill & Discipline**	**-.07**

TABLE 36 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
M. WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN IF A PUPIL DAMAGES PROPERTY IN A SCHOOL?

	Restitution				Discipline						
	Pupil		Parent		School		Police		Ignore		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	66	76.7	3	3.5	13	15.1	1	1.2	3	3.5	86
H 2	68	80.0	2	2.4	12	14.1	0	0	3	3.5	85
SUM	134	78.4	5	2.9	25	14.6	1	0.6	6	3.5	171
MH 1	81	73.6	4	3.6	15	13.6	1	0.9	9	8.2	110
MH 2	15	53.6	2	7.1	9	32.1	0	0	2	7.1	28
MH 3	53	63.1	5	5.9	14	16.7	2	2.4	10	11.9	84
MH 4	33	71.7	1	2.2	8	17.4	1	2.3	3	6.5	46
MH 5	79	68.7	1	0.9	26	22.6	3	2.6	6	5.2	115
SUM	261	68.1	13	3.4	72	18.8	7	1.8	30	7.8	383
M 1	14	66.7	1	4.8	5	23.8	0	0	1	4.8	21
M 2	68	69.4	2	2.0	14	14.3	3	3.1	11	11.2	98
M 3	17	58.6	0	0	8	27.6	2	6.9	2	6.9	29
M 4	17	68.0	0	0	5	20.0	0	0	3	12.0	25
SUM	116	67.1	3	1.7	32	18.5	5	2.9	17	9.9	173
ML 1	83	73.5	2	1.8	23	20.4	2	1.8	3	2.7	113
ML 2	114	83.8	5	3.7	11	8.1	0	0.0	6	4.4	136
ML 3	25	73.5	0	0	5	14.7	1	2.9	3	8.8	34
SUM	222	78.4	7	2.5	39	13.8	3	1.1	12	4.2	283
L 1	29	65.9	0	0	9	20.5	2	4.6	4	9.1	44
L 2	99	86.8	5	4.4	8	7.0	1	0.9	1	0.9	114
SUM	128	81.0	5	3.2	17	10.8	3	1.9	5	3.2	158
TOTAL	861	73.7	33	2.8	185	15.8	19	1.6	70	6.0	1168

Rank Order Association with Damage

Discipline -.03 Restitution .00

TABLE 37 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
N. - R. WHY DO PUPILS DAMAGE SCOOL PROPERTY?
Summary of First Choices

	Boredom		Attention		To Belong		Idleness		Revenge		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	10	11.6	42	48.8	10	11.6	5	5.8	19	22.1	86
H 2	13	15.3	42	49.4	14	16.5	5	5.9	11	12.9	85
SUM	23	13.5	84	49.1	24	14.0	10	5.8	30	17.5	171
MH 1	19	17.4	49	45.0	17	15.6	10	9.2	14	12.8	109
MH 2	4	14.3	14	50.0	2	7.1	0	0	8	28.6	28
MH 3	11	12.9	33	38.7	11	12.9	3	3.5	27	31.9	85
MH 4	4	8.7	18	39.1	9	19.6	2	4.3	13	28.3	46
MH 5	19	16.5	38	33.0	17	14.8	13	11.3	28	24.3	115
SUM	57	14.9	152	39.7	56	14.6	28	7.3	90	23.5	383
M 1	2	9.5	11	52.4	0	0	1	4.8	7	33.3	21
M 2	10	10.1	39	39.4	10	10.1	5	5.1	35	35.4	99
M 3	2	6.9	16	55.2	5	17.2	2	6.9	4	13.8	29
M 4	6	24.0	9	36.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	5	20.0	25
SUM	20	11.5	75	43.1	17	9.8	11	6.3	51	29.3	174
ML 1	16	14.0	43	37.7	16	14.0	8	7.0	31	27.2	114
ML 2	13	9.5	64	46.7	24	17.5	3	2.2	33	24.1	137
ML 3	2	5.9	15	44.0	5	14.7	1	2.9	11	32.4	34
SUM	31	10.9	122	42.8	45	15.8	12	4.2	75	26.3	285
L 1	5	11.4	10	22.7	16	36.4	1	2.3	12	27.3	44
L 2	7	6.0	50	43.1	18	15.5	14	12.1	27	23.3	116
SUM	12	7.5	60	37.5	34	21.3	15	9.4	39	24.4	160
TOTAL	143	12.2	493	42.0	176	15.0	76	6.5	285	24.3	1173

Rank Order Association with Damage

Boredom	.44	Attention	.24
To Belong	-.18	Idleness	.05
Revenge	-.20	Boredome & Idle	.29

TABLE 38 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
S. HOW DO PUPILS FEEL ABOUT YOUR PRINCIPAL?

	Severe		Just		Admirable		Lax		Weak		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	7	8.1	56	65.1	10	11.6	6	7.0	7	8.1	86
H 2	19	22.6	54	64.2	7	8.3	4	4.8	0	0	84
SUM	26	15.3	110	64.7	17	10.0	10	5.9	7	4.1	170
MH 1	28	25.5	64	58.2	2	1.8	6	5.5	10	9.1	110
MH 2	5	17.9	14	50.0	0	0	5	17.9	4	14.3	28
MH 3	5	6.0	49	58.3	8	9.5	10	11.9	12	14.3	84
MH 4	19	41.3	17	37.0	2	4.4	2	4.4	6	13.0	46
MH 5	33	29.0	68	59.7	9	7.9	1	0.9	3	2.6	114
SUM	90	23.6	212	55.5	21	5.5	24	6.3	35	9.2	382
M 1	6	28.6	6	28.6	3	14.3	3	14.3	3	14.3	21
M 2	17	17.4	68	69.4	6	6.1	2	2.0	5	5.1	98
M 3	0	0	23	79.3	5	17.2	1	3.5	0	0	29
M 4	7	28.0	13	52.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	25
SUM	30	17.3	110	63.6	16	9.2	7	4.0	10	5.8	173
ML 1	0	0	63	55.8	35	31.0	12	10.6	3	2.7	113
ML 2	19	14.1	93	68.9	17	12.6	2	1.5	4	3.0	135
ML 3	7	20.6	23	67.7	2	5.9	1	2.9	1	2.9	34
SUM	26	9.2	179	63.5	54	19.1	15	5.3	8	2.8	282
L 1	9	20.5	30	68.2	4	9.1	1	2.3	0	0	44
L 2	31	27.7	68	60.7	8	7.1	4	3.6	1	0.9	112
SUM	40	25.6	98	62.8	12	7.7	5	3.2	1	0.6	156
TOTAL	212	18.2	709	61.0	120	10.3	61	5.3	61	5.3	1163

Rank Order Association with Damage

Lax & Weak .40 Just -.26
Severe .10

counselor acted as a disciplinarian. In 8.4% of the cases the student reported that the function of the counselor was not known. It is interesting to note that, although all correlation values except one are below level of acceptance, those relating to favorable comments about the counselor are all positive, while those unfavorable are all negative. This suggests, although only slightly, an association between favorable student attitudes toward the counselor and high damage rank of the school; low damage rank seems associated with a proportionately higher rate of responses unfavorable to the counselor. These findings are clearly not consistent with what was expected, nor with other findings in this study.

U. How strict are your teachers? About seventy-four per cent of the pupils felt that their teachers were neither excessively strict nor too mild and indulgent. The correlation values, although below our criterion for acceptance are negative for the responses "excessive", moderate and balanced "strictness", and positive for "mild and indulgent". In other words, in high damage schools proportionately more children tended to report that their teachers were lacking in strictness, while those in low damage schools felt that their teachers were either excessively strict, or moderate and balanced in strictness.

V. How do pupils behave when you have substitute teachers? More than half of the students indicated that they give substitute or supply teachers "a hard time". The correlation of .51 points to a moderately high association between such conduct or response and high damage rating of the school. On the other hand, the moderately high negative correlation of -.57 obtained between the response "act the same" and damage rank indicates an association between cooperative and helpful behavior on the part of the students towards a substitute and low school damage rank. There appears, also, a limited negative association between damage rank and proportion of students in a school who responded that they would "pay little attention to" or disregard substitutes in the classroom. Thus, in low damage schools there is a greater tendency, than in high damage schools, to act in the usual way when a teacher substitute arrives, or to disregard him.

W. How do pupils feel about the custodian? In response to the question about student attitudes toward the custodian, 75% indicated that they felt the custodian to be always or sometimes friendly and helpful to the students. There appears to be an association between high damage rating of the school and the proportion of students in the school who feel that the custodian is unfriendly, criticizes and blames the students for damage, and "spies" on them. A negative correlation, although low, was obtained between damage rank and rank on proportion of students who feel that the custodian is a "real friend". It seems that high damage is associated with unfriendly relations with the custodian, and low damage is

TABLE 39 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
T. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE COUNSELORS IN YOUR SCHOOL?

	Concerned		Limited		Indifferent		Discipline		Don't Know		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	62	72.1	10	11.6	3	3.5	5	5.8	6	7.0	86
H 2	51	60.7	11	13.1	3	3.6	14	16.7	5	5.9	84
SUM	113	66.5	21	12.4	6	3.5	19	11.2	11	6.5	170
MH 1	56	50.9	21	19.1	10	9.1	8	7.3	15	13.6	110
MH 2	16	57.1	4	14.3	4	14.3	2	7.1	2	7.1	28
MH 3	60	71.4	7	8.3	5	5.9	8	9.5	4	4.8	84
MH 4	38	82.6	3	6.5	1	2.2	1	2.2	3	6.5	46
MH 5	60	52.1	23	20.0	10	8.7	13	11.3	9	7.8	115
SUM	230	60.1	58	15.1	30	7.8	32	8.3	33	8.6	383
M 1	6	28.6	6	28.6	6	28.6	3	14.3	0	0	21
M 2	51	52.0	8	8.2	9	9.2	21	21.4	9	9.2	98
M 3	18	64.3	7	25.0	1	3.6	0	0	2	7.1	28
M 4	9	36.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	6	24.0	5	20.0	25
SUM	84	48.8	23	13.4	19	11.0	30	17.4	16	9.3	172
ML 1	55	49.6	17	15.3	10	9.0	24	21.6	5	4.5	111
ML 2	99	72.8	12	8.8	5	3.7	6	4.4	14	10.3	136
ML 3	22	64.7	1	2.9	2	5.9	5	14.7	4	11.8	34
SUM	176	62.6	30	10.7	17	6.0	35	12.5	23	8.2	281
L 1	20	45.5	8	18.2	2	4.6	7	15.9	7	15.9	44
L 2	51	44.4	36	31.3	18	15.7	2	1.7	8	6.9	115
SUM	71	44.7	44	27.7	20	12.6	9	5.7	15	9.4	159
TOTAL	674	57.9	176	15.1	92	7.9	125	10.7	98	8.4	1165

Rank Order Association with Damage

Concerned	**.35**	**Concerned & Limited**	**.27**
Indifferent	**-.27**	**Don't Know**	**-.24**
Discipline	**-.11**		

TABLE 40 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
U. HOW STRICT ARE YOUR TEACHERS?

	Excessive		Moderate		Balanced		Mild		Indulgent		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	4	4.7	31	36.0	39	45.4	8	9.3	4	4.7	86
H 2	5	5.9	35	41.2	38	44.7	5	5.9	2	2.4	85
SUM	9	5.3	66	38.6	77	45.0	13	7.6	6	3.5	171
MH 1	8	7.3	19	17.3	63	57.3	16	14.6	4	4.0	110
MH 2	8	28.6	9	32.1	6	21.4	2	7.1	3	10.7	28
MH 3	11	13.1	24	28.6	38	45.2	6	7.1	5	6.0	84
MH 4	3	6.5	13	28.3	25	54.4	4	8.7	1	2.2	46
MH 5	19	16.5	32	27.8	49	42.6	12	10.4	3	2.6	115
SUM	49	12.8	97	25.3	181	47.3	40	10.4	16	4.2	383
M 1	3	14.3	7	33.3	9	42.9	2	9.5	0	0	21
M 2	23	23.5	26	26.5	42	42.9	4	4.1	3	3.1	98
M 3	0	0	9	31.0	12	41.4	7	24.1	1	3.5	29
M 4	8	32.0	5	20.0	8	32.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	25
SUM	34	19.7	47	27.2	71	41.0	15	8.7	6	3.5	173
ML 1	23	20.4	30	26.6	44	38.9	13	11.5	3	2.7	113
ML 2	22	16.1	51	37.2	50	36.5	11	8.0	3	2.2	137
ML 3	4	11.8	11	32.4	17	50.0	1	2.9	1	2.9	34
SUM	49	17.3	92	32.4	111	39.1	25	8.8	7	2.5	284
L 1	15	34.1	13	29.6	16	36.4	0	0	0	0	44
L 2	4	3.5	41	36.0	51	44.7	16	14.0	2	1.8	114
SUM	19	12.0	54	34.2	67	42.4	16	10.1	2	1.3	158
TOTAL	160	13.7	356	30.5	507	43.4	109	9.3	37	3.2	1169

Rank Order Association with Damage

Excessive -.29 **Moderate & Balanced** -.26
Mild & Indulgent .21

TABLE 41 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
V. HOW DO PUPILS BEHAVE WHEN YOU HAVE SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS?

	Exemplary		Cooperate		Customarily		Disregard		Plague		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	5	5.8	8	9.3	7	8.1	15	17.4	51	59.3	86
H 2	2	2.4	2	2.4	6	7.1	21	25.0	53	63.1	84
SUM	7	4.1	10	5.9	13	7.6	36	21.2	104	61.2	170
MH 1	0	0	7	6.4	13	11.9	24	21.8	66	60.0	110
MH 2	1	3.6	0	0	2	7.1	2	7.1	23	82.1	28
MH 3	5	6.0	8	9.5	12	14.3	11	13.1	48	57.1	84
MH 4	0	0	1	2.1	2	4.4	8	17.4	35	76.1	46
MH 5	6	5.2	11	9.6	23	20.0	26	22.6	49	42.6	115
SUM	12	3.1	27	7.0	52	13.6	71	18.5	221	57.7	383
M 1	0	0	0	0	5	23.8	5	23.8	11	52.4	21
M 2	4	4.1	11	11.2	19	19.4	10	10.2	54	55.1	98
M 3	6	20.7	3	10.4	5	17.2	6	20.7	9	31.0	29
M 4	1	4.0	4	16.0	5	20.0	5	20.0	10	40.0	25
SUM	11	6.4	18	10.4	34	19.7	26	15.0	84	48.6	173
ML 1	3	2.7	7	6.2	32	28.3	29	25.7	42	37.2	113
ML 2	6	4.4	8	5.9	9	6.7	38	28.2	74	54.8	135
ML 3	2	5.9	3	8.8	10	29.4	5	14.7	14	41.2	34
SUM	11	3.9	18	6.4	51	18.1	72	25.5	130	46.1	282
L 1	0	0	1	2.3	4	9.1	13	29.6	26	59.1	44
L 2	3	2.6	5	4.4	25	21.8	38	33.0	44	38.3	115
SUM	3	1.8	6	3.8	29	18.2	51	32.1	70	44.0	159
TOTAL	44	3.8	79	6.8	179	15.3	256	21.9	609	52.2	1167

Rank Order Association with Damage

Exemplary & Cooperate	**.07**	**Customary**	**-.57**
Disregard	**-.24**	**Plague**	**.51**

TABLE 42 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
W. HOW DO PUPILS FEEL ABOUT THE CUSTODIAN?

	Friendly		Casual		Ignores		Blames		Spies		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	21	24.4	25	29.1	14	16.3	10	11.6	16	18.6	86
H 2	25	29.8	24	28.6	15	17.9	11	13.1	9	10.7	84
SUM	46	27.1	49	28.8	29	17.1	21	12.4	25	14.7	170
MH 1	59	55.1	33	30.8	8	7.5	2	1.9	5	4.7	107
MH 2	21	75.0	5	17.9	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0	28
MH 3	39	46.4	23	27.4	15	17.8	2	2.4	5	6.0	84
MH 4	17	36.9	23	50.0	3	6.5	1	2.2	2	4.4	46
MH 5	75	66.5	24	21.2	10	8.9	2	1.8	2	1.8	113
SUM	211	55.8	108	28.6	37	9.8	8	2.1	14	3.7	378
M 1	19	95.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.0	20
M 2	25	25.8	36	37.1	9	9.3	12	12.4	15	15.5	97
M 3	3	10.7	10	35.8	7	25.0	5	17.9	3	10.7	28
M 4	12	48.0	9	36.0	3	12.0	0	0	1	4.0	25
SUM	59	34.7	55	32.4	19	11.2	17	10.0	20	11.8	170
ML 1	50	45.1	42	37.8	6	5.4	7	6.3	6	5.4	111
ML 2	58	43.9	32	24.2	36	27.3	2	1.5	4	3.0	132
ML 3	17	50.0	7	20.6	7	20.6	2	5.9	1	2.9	34
SUM	125	45.1	81	29.2	49	17.7	11	4.0	11	4.0	277
L 1	26	59.1	14	31.8	0	0	3	6.8	1	2.3	44
L 2	72	63.2	18	15.8	22	19.3	0	0	2	1.8	114
SUM	98	61.6	32	20.3	22	13.9	3	1.9	3	1.9	158
TOTAL	539	46.8	325	28.2	156	13.5	60	5.2	73	6.3	1153

Rank Order Association with Damage

Blames & Spies	**.48**	**Friendly**	**-.23**
Ignores & Blames	**.14**	**Friendly & Casual**	**-.09**

related to a friendly climate between students and custodian.

X. What is your father's job? Blue collar occupation of father, defined as including skilled and semi-skilled craftsman, service and protective workers, laborers, and unemployed, was found to have a low but positive association with high damage in school. There was found a slightly higher, but negative, correlation between damage rank and rank order of school in the proportion of parents listed as professional workers, executives, managers and proprietors. Thus, the data suggest an association of blue collar occupation of fathers with high damage, and of parents in higher occupational levels with low damage.

Y. Does he own his shop, business or office? Correlations of responses on this question and damage rank of the school were too low to be considered significant. However, ownership of shop, business or office was negatively correlated with damage rank, while non-ownership was positively associated with high damage rating of the school.

Z. Do your parents own your home? Correlations again were too low to be considered significant. Home ownership seems very slightly associated with low damage rank, while high ranking on non-ownership was very slightly associated with high rate of school damage.

Summary

A questionnaire was administered to a sample of 1170 junior and senior high school students. Analysis of the rank order correlations between school damage rating and percent of students responding to a given item, revealed the following characteristics in which students in high damage schools exceed those in schools rating low on damage. Students were attending school for the purpose of preparation for a job, rather than for college. These students considered their school as the poorest in the city or poorer than most. To them, loyalty to the school meant attending or participating in sports or other activities. These students, to a greater extent than students in low damage schools, admitted that they did nothing to better the school, or that they actively did some harm to the school. Student participation in planning school policies or programs was low in the high damage schools. These students described vandalism as a result of boredom. They more frequently considered their principal as lax and weak in his administration, the teachers as mild and indulgent, and the custodian as unfriendly toward them. They gave substitute teachers a "hard time". Their parents, who were usually engaged in "blue collar" occupations, either expressed an unfavorable, critical attitude toward the school, or were non-commital on

TABLE 43 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
X. WHAT IS YOUR FATHER'S JOB?

	Professional Executive Manager Proprietor		Semi-Prof. Clerical Sales		Blue Collar*		Don't Know		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	4	4.0	11	13.6	65	80.0	1	1.2	81
H 2	14	16.5	24	28.2	47	55.3	0	0	85
SUM	18	10.8	35	21.1	112	67.5	1	0.6	166
MH 1	20	19.7	10	9.9	72	70.6	0	0	102
MH 2	11	39.2	7	25.0	10	35.7	0	0	28
MH 3	7	8.7	18	22.5	55	68.8	0	0	80
MH 4	15	34.1	7	16.0	21	47.7	1	2.3	44
MH 5	17	14.7	22	19.1	64	55.7	12	10.4	115
SUM	70	19.0	64	17.3	222	60.2	13	3.5	369
M 1	3	14.2	1	4.8	17	81.0	0	0	21
M 2	9	9.7	11	12.0	70	76.1	2	2.3	92
M 3	3	10.7	6	21.4	19	67.9	0	0	28
M 4	0	0	1	4.4	20	87.0	2	8.7	23
SUM	15	9.1	19	11.6	126	76.8	4	2.4	164
ML 1	25	22.9	30	27.5	54	49.5	0	0	109
ML 2	68	51.9	31	23.7	32	24.4	0	0	131
ML 3	7	20.7	2	5.8	25	73.5	0	0	34
SUM	100	36.5	63	23.0	111	40.5	0	0	274
L 1	9	22.5	12	30.0	19	47.5	0	0	40
L 2	55	50.9	29	27.1	23	21.3	0	0	107
SUM	64	43.5	41	27.9	42	28.6	0	0	147
TOTAL	267	23.8	222	19.8	613	54.7	18	1.6	1120

* Including skilled and semi-skilled craftsmen, service and protective workers, laborers, and unemployed.

Rank Order Association with Damage

Professional etc.	-.35	Semi-Prof. etc.	-.13
Blue Collar	.23		

TABLE 44 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Y. DOES HE OWN HIS SHOP, BUSINESS OR OFFICE?

	Yes		No		Part Owner		Part Time		Don't Know		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	5	6.5	66	85.7	2	2.6	3	3.9	1	1.3	77
H 2	16	19.5	66	80.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
SUM	21	13.2	132	83.0	2	1.3	3	1.9	1	0.6	159
MH 1	11	11.0	88	88.0	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	100
MH 2	4	16.0	21	84.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
MH 3	6	7.8	71	92.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
MH 4	7	15.6	38	84.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
MH 5	10	9.8	89	87.3	2	2.0	0	0	1	1.0	102
SUM	38	10.9	307	88.0	3	0.9	0	0	1	0.3	349
M 1	3	15.0	17	85.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
M 2	13	14.9	74	85.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
M 3	0	0	26	92.9	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0	28
M 4	1	4.8	20	95.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
SUM	17	10.9	137	87.8	1	0.6	1	0.6	0	0	156
ML 1	10	9.9	89	88.1	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	101
ML 2	34	25.6	94	70.7	5	3.8	0	0	0	0	133
ML 3	7	21.9	25	78.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
SUM	51	19.2	208	78.2	7	2.6	0	0	0	0	266
L 1	4	11.8	29	85.3	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	34
L 2	30	28.0	72	67.3	5	4.7	0	0	0	0	107
SUM	34	24.1	101	71.6	5	3.5	0	0	1	0.7	141
TOTAL	161	15.0	885	82.6	18	1.7	4	0.4	3	0.3	1071

Rank Order Association with Damage

Yes	**-.23**	**No**	**.16**

TABLE 45 STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Z. DO YOUR PARENTS OWN YOUR HOME?

	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total
School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
H 1	36	41.9	48	55.8	2	2.3	86
H 2	62	72.9	19	22.4	4	4.7	85
SUM	98	57.3	67	39.2	6	3.5	171
MH 1	75	69.4	29	26.9	4	3.7	108
MH 2	19	67.9	7	25.0	2	7.1	28
MH 3	48	57.1	31	36.9	5	6.0	84
MH 4	25	54.4	19	41.3	2	4.4	46
MH 5	68	61.3	41	36.9	2	1.8	111
SUM	235	62.3	127	33.7	15	4.0	377
M 1	12	57.1	9	42.9	0	0	21
M 2	63	64.3	33	33.7	2	2.0	98
M 3	20	69.0	9	31.0	0	0	29
M 4	9	36.0	14	56.0	2	8.0	25
SUM	104	60.1	65	37.6	4	2.3	173
ML 1	77	69.4	28	25.2	6	5.4	111
ML 2	102	77.3	27	20.5	3	2.3	132
ML 3	13	38.2	20	58.8	1	2.9	34
SUM	192	69.3	75	27.1	10	3.5	277
L 1	29	67.4	13	30.2	1	2.3	43
L 2	94	81.1	17	14.8	4	3.5	115
SUM	123	77.8	30	19.0	5	3.2	158
TOTAL	752	65.1	364	31.5	40	3.5	1156

Rank Order Association with Damage

Yes	**-.22**	**No**	**.19**

the subject.

In contrast, low damage schools exceed high damage schools in the proportion of students who were preparing for college and who felt that their school was the best or better than most. They reported that they and their friends worked actively to improve the school. For them, loyalty meant "doing something for the school". There was active student participation in planning programs and policies of the school. These students interpreted vandalism as occuring in a spirit of revenge, or as an attempt to obtain peer group acceptance. They respected and admired their school principal, felt that their teachers were excessively or moderately strict, and reported that the custodian was friendly toward the students. They did not report, to the same extent as students in high damage schools, giving a substitute teacher a "hard time". Their parents were largely professionals, executives, managers or proprietors, who expressed a favorable attitude toward the school.

The School Histories

The history of each school was obtained by a member of the project staff* through a series of interviews with school principals, teachers, and also retired teachers. In some cases printed materials about the school were available. The purpose of this phase of the study was to obtain some generalizations regarding school organization which might contribute to the better understanding of the complex of factors presumed related to the problem of school property damage. Certain items of information obtained from these histories and from the earlier teacher interviews were felt to be significant for the problems of low morale and high damage.

These history items are not presented as causes of vandalism, but as items associated, in the reports of our respondents, with the problem of morale in the school. They were not found limited to high damage schools, but were found in all schools. The order in which these items are presented below does not imply priority or rank in significance for our problem. No single item is to be considered in itself of crucial import. It is probable that the answer to our problem lies in the confluence of several of these factors, and that weakness in one area might be compensated for by strength in another.

The teachers interviewed exhibited a high degree of loyalty to the school and to the principal. Even when what might be termed destructive criticism was elicited, it obviously was given in the hope that an improvement in the situation might result. Teachers were generally protective of their principals except in a very few cases where outright antagonism was shown. They were also, for the most part, defensive of the students, pointing out, even in high damage areas, that student behavior in the school was a result of parental neglect, or the shortcomings of the community, or the educational system. In the various interviews teachers were frequently freer in their blame of themselves and of their own colleagues than in their blame of others for what happened in the school.

The information obtained in these histories cannot be presented by schools without violating our rule of anonymity. We shall, therefore, discuss these data without reference to specific schools, but in terms of certain general categories of events or situations. In our analysis of the obtained histories the events or situations seemed to fall into five categories. These were: 1) change and instability, 2) security in role, 3) administration and leadership 4) identification with the school and its values, and 5) welfare, the feeling that the

* Lila Piper collected the materials for this section, interviewing each of the sixteen school principals and a number of retired school teachers each of whom had been associated with a given school for a number of years.

needs of staff and students are being considered. These categories, we recognize, are not mutually exclusive, nor do they cover the whole range of events in the history of a school. However, they seem to us to be significant in viewing the pattern of interrelations between the various members of the school as these are related to the problems of morale and property damage.

Change and instability. Change in the socio-economic level of the community was felt to bring with it modification of the student and parent interest in the school. It was pointed out that the transition from an area of predominantly owner-occupied dwellings to one of rented homes, or a variation in the ethnic or racial composition of the community, was accompanied by a decrease in the interest in education and a change in the attitude toward the school. A shift in the population in the direction of a lower socio-economic status bringing with it more working mothers, broken homes, dependency, etc., would seriously affect the relations of children with the school. It was indicated that a stable neighborhood was associated with approved conventional behavior in the school, while a situation of transiency or change was correlated with low morale and vandalism.

Change in the composition of the student body were repeatedly mentioned in connection with conduct problems in the school. Population movements or the redefinition of the school district boundaries may result in the diversification of communities served by the school and the introduction of groups from markedly different socio-economic areas with different orientations toward education and the school. The incorporation of a low-economic public housing group into an almost solidly upper-middle class school created temporarily some serious disciplinary problems for the administrative staff. The task of providing a satisfactory curriculum to such a heterogeneous population becomes quite complex and must be worked out over a period of time. In the meanwhile, problems of adjustment may become quite acute. Transfer of a whole grade from one school to another less popular school resulted, in one instance, in publicly expressed dissatisfaction by parents. This was reflected in restlessness and dissatisfaction of the transferred students in the new school and a sudden rash of broken windows in the old.

Turnover of a large segment of the staff at one time was indicated as resulting in the disorganization of the school routine. New office personnel, unfamiliar with the traditional practices in the school may disturb the routine of principal, teachers and students. When change occurs at the same time in principal, teaching staff and office personnel, as it did in one school we studied, the break in organization may be reflected in increased restlessness among students. Indeed, this school suffered, for the first time in a number of years several broken windows inside the building. When a group of new teachers are brought into a school, as in the case where a junior high group was moved into what had been an all-senior high school, disruption of the harmonious pattern of relations occurred. Such assimilation may be further impeded when all the new teachers are placed together, separating them spatially from the older teachers in the school, or when the sex ratio among the teachers is disturbed.

The significance of staff stability was pointed out to us by the frequent references, in low damage schools, to the high proportion of the "original" faculty who were still in the school, and to the high level of consensus among them. In some low morale schools, however, conflict was frequently mentioned between experienced or "old" teachers and newcomers in the profession. The latter were accused of being in the field only for monetary reasons and to have no interest in their pupils. They were blamed for the rapid turnover in personnel, and with having no roots or firm interest in the school.

A source of difficulty in student adjustment at the junior or senior high school level frequently referred to was defined as the lack of discipline at the lower grade levels. The change from the elementary schcol routine to the junior high program with its less intense contact with one teacher was thought to be disturbing to some children. Students unaccustomed to "discipline" at the elementary level would be apt to misuse the relative freedom from control in the high school. With a diffusion of contacts with teachers at the junior high level the student may not achieve a personal identification with the school through a close association with one adult person.

Security in role. The operation of the school under the direction of a definite and consistent policy, with an adequate definition of school routines and lines of responsibility was said to result in an atmosphere in which morale was high. Some schools provided this information in the form of handbooks for teachers and for students. School procedures and routines, as well as the policies and philosophy of the school were described. Such a handbook afforded a degree of security for teachers and students insofar as they had available an official conduct guide to which they could refer. They were thus acquainted with the requirements of their assigned roles in the school, and could structure their conduct in accordance with a set of established expectations. Where such definition of roles and responsibilities was unclear, or where interpersonal relations in the school were subject to the momentary and unpredictable whims of the principal, morale was adversely affected.

The orientation of a principal in a new position was reported to be of crucial importance in the determination of the nature of his relationship with his staff, students and their parents. Entering into a school without an intimate knowledge of the folkways and customs of the school, or without information on the informal power structure among the staff, or the nature of the parent-teacher relationships, or the whole picture of student attitudes, places a severe burden on the principal. Essential is a period of adjustment, the length of which will depend on his skill in the area of human relations, his skill as an administrator, and the degree of cooperation he receives from the staff. A high-damage, low morale situation might be inherited by a principal from his predecessor which might take him several years to correct. When staff allegience is split, some venerating the old and some supporting the new, the new principal is placed in a difficult position.

To avoid anxiety regarding role performance the new teacher also needs orientation in the school routines, folkways, and goals. In some schools it was found that the new teacher was introduced to the staff at a formal faculty meeting and advised to seek help from one of the older teachers when necessary. In other schools the new faculty member was escorted by the principal to each of the classrooms and introduced to each teacher, and then more or less informally placed under the guidance of one of the more mature faculty members Adjustment was further facilitated by the availability of the handbook mentioned above. The initial integration of the teacher into the faculty was emphasized, by our informants, as crucial in structuring the teacher's feeling of security in the school. This attitude would,in turn, be communicated to the students in the teacher's relations with them.

The nature of the orientation program provided incoming students was indicated as very significant in influencing the child's attitudes toward the school. In some schools the prospective students were invited for a formal visit during the term prior to their admission to the school. They would be told about the school, its history and ideals, and meet the principal, faculty, students and, in some instances, the custodian. The orientation in other schools was described as limited to an exposure to a series of authoritative announcements at a formal assembly on the first day of the school term. When it becomes necessary, as it was in some of the schools we studied, to orientate students of several different grades at the same time, the problem for the staff is compounded. Lacking an effective orientation of his entrance into the school, the new student faces a role definition problem which might leave him confused regarding the conduct expected of him by the staff. If, in addition, the administrative policy is unclear or capricious, the student is left bewildered and insecure.

The lack of adequate communication between principal, teachers, students, and parents was reported as an important factor in the feelings of insecurity encountered in some schools. Where policies, attitudes, goals, and information are not shared, cooperative action in a school is impeded. In some schools student assemblies were infrequent and tended to be routine and dull. On the other hand we found that in high morale schools assemblies were held regularly and well organized programs were presented usually by the students. Staff meetings in some schools were concerned only with the routine reporting of the latest Board of Education meetings or of directives initiated by the principal. High morale schools were indicated as having democratically conducted staff meetings where significant issues were discussed and teachers were given an opportunity to express themselves on matters of school policy. Similarly, the communication of school policies, problems and needs to parents through PTA or Mothers Club groups was considered essential in structuring proper parent attitudes toward the school.

A complaint voiced by teachers in low morale schools was that ofentimes they were not informed of the action taken by the principal in the case of a student sent to him because of an infraction of the school rules. No communication, at this point, left the teacher in doubt regarding his authority position in the classroom. Although teachers in high damage schools indicated, to a greater extent than did teachers in low damage schools, that discipline was the province of the principal, they felt that the teacher should be consulted in the case of a student he had referred to the principal. They felt strongly that they should at least be informed of the principal's decision in the case.

Administration-leadership. The principal is the key person in the administration of the school. The appointment by the Board of Education of a principal who is not popular with the parents, or who is not adequately trained for the particular school to which he is assigned was indicated as having a serious effect on the level of interpersonal relations in the school. It was suggested by a number of the teachers interviewed that a more careful matching of the principal, in terms of background, interests, experience, and personality, with the needs of a particular school would result in a more effective operation of the school and increased service to the community. The assignment of a principal to a school, it was suggested, should be made on the basis of the administrative skills and pedagogical orientation which would be most appropriate to the particular school in question, rather than merely on the basis of seniority or availability.

In the school, the principal appears to be the major prestige bearing individual. His personality, his administrative skill, and his educational philosophy determine, to a large extent, the morale of the staff and students. The nature of his personal and official relations with staff, students and parents significantly influences their attitudes toward the school. The lack of a clearly perceived set of policies which the principal administers consistently, fairly and firmly makes for confusion and insecurity among faculty and students. Inconsistency and unpredictability were stressed by our respondents as the most undesirable personality traits in a principal.

A principal who was unreasonably dictatorial and tyrranical or, at the other extreme, too permissive, was associated with low school morale by our informants. An insecure, nervous or frustrated principal was indicated as communicating his anxiety to the whole school. A principal whose academic standards were considered to be low, or whose expectations of staff and students were minimal did not develop an esprit de corps among his staff or students. The principal who himself had little or no pride in his school cannot instill in the staff or students any enthusiasm for the school.

Teachers emphasized the need for the principal to encourage, by precept and example, teamwork and cooperation among his staff. They felt that in his administration he should be democratic and firm. However, he might be autocratic or "bossy", but if at the same time he were a firm disciplinarian, supporting his teachers in their reasonable decisions, and "approachable" by teachers seeking help, he would be considered a "good" principal to work with. One complaint heard frequently in high damage situations was that the principal criticised teachers publicly, and especially in front of students. This, of course, posed a serious threat to the prestige and authority of the teacher vis a vis the student body. It was stressed that, above all, the principal must gain the respect of students, staff and parents. He should be able to delegate authority and trust his staff to carry out their assigned responsibilities without his personal supervision.

A point raised frequently by teachers in both high and low damage schools was the nature of the discipline maintained by the principal. Fairness, firmness and consistency were the characteristics reported as most crucial. Inconsistency in matters of discipline was frequently mentioned as an important factor in low morale suffered when the principal failed to support the teacher in matters of discipline. Teachers in low damage schools felt that the teacher should be given the responsiblity of handling most discipline problems in the classroom Discipline should not be the responsibility of the principal alone, and every member of the staff should be obligated to enforce school regulations wherever students were involved. It was emphasized by teachers in low damage schools that the teacher's concern with student conduct should not be limited to the classroom, and that teachers should be aware of and take responsibility for directing student behavior anywhere in or around the school building. This view was not found so prevalent in high damage schools.

It was reported that, in some instances where the principal was not an efficient administrator, the teachers informally assumed administrative responsibility for the school, compensating for the principal's weaknesses, provided they had a personal liking for him. If discipline is weak the teachers might decide, individually or collectively, to handle problems of misbehavior themselves rather than burden the principal with them. In some schools, with an experienced faculty, proud of the traditions of the school, and where a large part of the faculty is senior to the principal in years of teaching, the principal may be informally relieved of most minor administrative decisions. Thus the faculty may become a significant element in the administration of the school. If there is,under these circumstances, consensus among the faculty regarding the goals and policies of the school, student and faculty satisfaction and morale will be high.

The custodian, in performing his duties of upkeep of the school plant comes into frequent contact with the principal, staff, and students. An unfavorable attitude of the custodian toward his job, or toward the faculty or students was indicated as being reflected in the condition of the school building. The custodian who took no pride in the building, or who did not have a strong feeling of responsibility in his job was unable to impart to the students a sense of respect for school property. Custodians reported, in interviews, instances of retributive behavior by students directed against their colleagues in other schools who were unnecessarily autocratic and punitive. In some schools teachers attributed excessive building damage to the uncooperative attitude of the custodian. Where broken or damaged equipment was not repaired when requested, or the custodian in other ways ignored the needs of staff or students, interest or pride in the physical plant suffered. In some schools the principal considered it essential to remove signs of damage as soon as possible, to eliminate the presence of what might be a stimulus to further damage When students were asked, in several schools, why there was so little damage, they replied, "Why, we like Mr. _______, we don't want to give him any extra work". In several low damage schools the custodian was customarily introduced to the new students as a member of the school staff. Some custodians obtained the cooperation of children playing around the school, not necessarily members of the school, by supplying them with play equipment. Where respect between students and custodian is mutual, and where the students are provided examples of sincere concern for public property by the custodian, damage was low.

Identification. The extent to which students, staff and community identify themselves with the school and its values was related, by our informants, to the level of morale in the school. Such identification may be observed in the degree of participation in school activities, in expressed attitudes toward the school and toward education, etc. The socio-economic status of the community served by the school was frequently referred to as a significant variable in the students' attitude toward the school. In general, it was indicated that interest in the school, and participation in school programs was greater in middle and in upper middle socio-economic areas than in lower class neighborhoods. The identification of the parents with the school and its goals was felt to have an effect on student attitudes. It was further pointed out in the interviews that schools which "belong" to the community in the sense that the adults were alumni of the school, or were actively interested in the school program through participation in the PTA or Mothers Club, or used the school as a center for community activities, would be less liable to suffer damage than would schools not so identified with the life of the community. Thus "neighborhood" as contrasted to "city" schools might be less subject to attacks of vandalism.

In the course of the life history of a school there develops a pattern of relationships which might be termed a "modal personality structure" or "reputation" by which the school can be identified. Students and teachers become identified with this "personality" by their peers and by the community. Events in the history of the school, by affecting administrative policy, may have a lasting effect on the interpersonal relations in the school. Teachers in one school referred frequently to the very unhappy experience of the staff and parents with a previous principal, pointing out how the memory of this situation affected the relations with the current principal. Faculty and students in a school which had a succession of capable and "strong" principals have developed a strong tradition of pride in their school. In several schools characterized by high morale teachers and principal proudly pointed to the high scholastic achievements of their students and to the list of alumni in positions of responsibility in the city of Syracuse.

Unfavorable newspaper publicity as a result of the misbehavior of one or a few students, or resulting from the activities of a neighborhood gang will identify the student body as "delinquents" or "hoods". In one school the students were upset about the nature of the reporting of an unfortunate accident on the school playground which, they felt, presented the public with a biased picture of the school. Personal identification with a school publically defined as inferior would be minimal. The faculty and students of schools rumored to be the "dumping ground" for students expelled from other public or parochial schools expressed the feeling that their reputation was being lowered.

The presence among the student body of a number who were disinterested in school but who remained as "hangers-on" because of a disinclination to go to work was reported as harmful to school morale. Such students did not identify with the school, its goals and program. Students who held part time jobs, waiting only to reach the legal drop-out age, and students who owned cars were described as participating minimally in extra-curricular activities, and having little identification with the school. Where, on the other hand, students are closely involved in the school program, through the student council and various extra curricular activities, identification and morale are apt to be high.

Lack of cohesiveness among teachers was mentioned as a problem in high damage schools. Where teachers formed cliques or were divided by loyalty to different members of the administrative staff, group action was impeded and identification of the staff as a whole with the school becomes lessened. In some schools, spontaneous social contacts, the exchange of professional ideas, and communication in general were minimal. In others, communication was encouraged by the presence of a tradition of professional and social cooperation, and a feeling of "belonging". Some older teachers referred to the lack of dedication to teaching as a career, and the lack of self identification as a professional, which they saw in younger colleagues, as the basis for low morale among teachers. Lack of dedication to the education of children, and lack of identification with the school, loyalty to the principal, etc., were felt to adversely influence the role of the teacher.

Welfare. Significant for the level of morale in the school was the extent of the feeling of students and teachers that the school, specifically the principal, was concerned with their welfare. Morale was positively affected when it was felt that the principal aggressively pressed for advantages for his school. Where he actively campaigned for equipment, programs, building improvements, new educational devices and techniques, and improved working conditions for staff and students, he was held in high respect. Parents, also, were sensitive to the concern of the principal with providing a better school for their children. In some instances where teachers felt that the principal was more responsive to the demands of parents or the school Board than to what they considered to be the needs of the school, morale was adversely affected.

Crowding and inadequate equipment were indicated as causes for discontent in the school, especially where faculty and students had the opportunity to make comparisons with other, more fortunate, schools. One school suffered a marked depression of morale when it was rumored that no repairs were to be made sine the building was to be abandoned. Morale was said to have improved when this rumor was refuted. However, teachers in general seemed less concerned about aged or outmoded furnishings than by the failure to repair or replace broken equipment. They could tolerate antiquated equipment, but not positive disinterest or neglect on the part of the custodian, the principal, or the Board of Education.

Dissatisfaction was encountered where teachers felt that they were not considered in the formation of school policy. Arbitrary transfer from one school to another was cited as a cause for feelings of anxiety and insecurity. Dissatisfaction was voiced by "floaters" -- teachers who had no room of their own, who moved from room to room and often kept their school materials in a brief case. In one school, interviews with the principal and with men teachers were held in the men's lavatory, which was the only place where the men teachers were allowed to smoke. In two other schools, smoking was allowed only in a section of the school basement. To be sure a teachers' room does not assure morale. However, the lack of a place where teachers can meet to discuss professional problems or to relax in the company of their colleagues may be interpreted as a lack of sensitivity in the administration to the needs or comfort of the faculty.

The feeling of discrimination or the lack of concern by the Board of Education for the interests of a particular group of students has aroused dissatisfaction in parents and students. The allottment of funds for new schools or equipment to the more privileged areas of the city was observed with resentment by teachers, students and parents in lower class areas. The complaint was heard in some schools that the only equipment they received was that which had been discarded when another school obtained new desks, laboratory or shop equipment. Such an attitude can hardly be conducive to a proper concern for school property on the part of the students.

Morale was low in schools where students and parents felt that the curriculum did not meet the perceived needs of the students. If curriculum changes do not keep pace with changes in the neighborhood the school will fail to serve what the parents may consider to be the best interests of their children. The continuation of an academic program in the face of a shift to a vocationally oriented population will invite dissatisfaction. During a period of reorganization of the city school program, disorganization was in evidence in a school which was undergoing a gradual change in curriculum. Outdated equipment was not replaced and certain courses were discontinued, leaving gaps in the curriculum in areas much in demand by students and parents.

Summary. Consideration of the histories obtained from the sixteen schools resulted in the analysis of the material in terms of five categories: 1) change and instability; 2) security in role; 3) administration-leadership; 4) identification; and 5) welfare. These categories were abstracted from the items related to us by our respondents as historically significant in the determination of the pattern of interpersonal relations in the school. Change in the community in the direction of lowering the socio-economic class status of the residents, or change in the student body effecting greater heterogeneity and less consensus, or change or turnover in the school staff, were described as leading to instability in the school organization. Insecurity in the role of the principal, teachers or students, due to inadequate orientation in duties or to poor communication was described as leading to anxiety and confusion. The leadership function of the principal, setting the standards of conduct for the school, was described as depending on his personality, ability to encourage teamwork in his staff, consistency and fairness in discipline. The custodian, as a member of the administrative staff, may evoke cooperation or antagonism from the students. The lack of identification of parents, students and teachers with the principles which the school symbolizes was indicated as a characteristic of a low-morale institution. The formation of cliques, or the alienation of individuals because of public identification of the school population as "delinquents or hoodlums" may contribute to the disruption of consensus in the school. Morale was also identified with the feeling that the principal and the Board of Education were concerned with the welfare of students and teachers and provided conditions of work and study consistent with their felt needs.

It may be concluded, from these reports, that a situation of insecurity and dissatisfaction existing in a school is conducive to the violation by children of some of the conduct norms of our society -- in the present context, those norms referring to property and education. Feelings of insecurity and dissatisfaction may be engendered by a state of heterogeneity involving norm and value conflict, with confusion in role definition, lack of personal identification with the school, and the impression that the school authorities were not interested in the welfare of the staff or students. Responsibility to the group is lessened when the individual feels that the institution administration is no longer concerned with his welfare. There follows a decrease in the dedication of the individual to the conventional group values. With decreased societal control, behavior becomes idiosyncratic, or possibly directed by a devian group or ideology. The individual or group violation of the societal conduct norms, in our case those regarding property and education, is thus facilitated and vandalism in the school may become a reality.

Summary and Conclusions

School vandalism is of concern to the citizen and to the educator because such behavior by children is damaging to the community both in terms of expense and in terms of interference with the education process. It is of special concern insofar as such behavior is indicative of the child's alienation from two important values in our society -- education and property. It is implied in such conduct that the school is not properly discharging its institutional function of impressing on the child the importance of these social values. This study was undertaken on the assumption that a socio-psychological study of the interpersonal relations between various groups in the school would cast light on some of the factors which might be presumed related to school vandalism.

It is probable that some children who commit acts of destruction in a school are emotionally disturbed, needing psychological attention. Such disturbed children may be serious problems in the school with aberrations in various areas of conduct. Our concern, however, is with one specific area of conduct -- that related to public school property. The problem for us is not, Why the psychological disturbance? but, Why is the activity directed against school property? To be sure, the child spends a good deal of his time in the school, often unwillingly. Also, he is in the custody of persons whom he might identify with his parents, or with frustrating adults in general. Some individual acts of property damage may be accounted for by the presence of a few troubled children in the school. It would be hardly logical, however, to explain the systematic differences in damage rates, which we observed between schools, by reference to variations in the concentration of disturbed children, either by chance or design, in the different schools, Out data showed, moreover, no relation between arrests for acts of delinquency or for malicious mischief and the rank of the school in property damage. The destructive behavior of children inside the school is, apparently, not associated with anti-social conduct on the outside. Such a situation would hardly maintain if school damage were entirely a function of anti-social, disturbed children.

The focus of this research has been the discovery of regularities or common elements in school situations which might be associated with the problem of vandalism. We have sought for variables in schools rated high in damage and those rated low, which might be used to account for such differences. It is assumed that certain factors or situations found more frequently in high damage schools than in schools with low damage are somehow related to the problem. We have presented what is basically a description of school situations in which vandalism or property damage is prevalent as opposed to situations in which it occurs with a low degree of frequency. These situations might be considered either as a cause or as an effect of vandalism - the nature of the relation cannot be implied from the statistical correlation. It may be that the attitudes found in a school are a function of the high damage situation in which the staff and student body finds itself, rather than a factor in the production of vandalism.

The unit of study was the school or, to be more exact, two or more schools having the same damage rating. It was not the individual vandal. The summed responses of teachers or of students formed the data on which the schools were compared. In every school we found what might be considered both favorable and unfavorable factors. Schools were compared in terms of the relative rates of responses on a given item. Our data or conclusions cannot be said to necessarily represent the majority opinion in a school, or of even a significant portion of the faculty or students. We can say, however, that with respect to a specific response category or item, a relatively higher or lower proportion of such responses were obtained in a given school or class of schools. Other schools also provided us with such responses, but to a different degree. The association of rank on frequency of response to a given item with rank on the damage scale was our basic unit of comparison.

The conclusions must be interpreted, of course, in the light of the adequacy of the tools used in this research. The interview schedule, the student questionnaire, and the history items were specifically designed for this study. No attempt was made to test the reliability of these instruments, or to standardize them. Undoubtedly, other variables might have been included in the interviews and in the questionnaire, and other conclusions might then have followed. The specific questions asked reflect our own biases with respect to the choice of significant variables for study.

The results must be considered also, in the light of the sample of schools, teachers and students which were available. Only those public schools of Syracuse which included junior or senior high school classes were studied. Within the schools, where we depended on the voluntary participation of teachers, it was not feasible to obtain either a random or a stratified sample of the staff. The voluntary participation in a research project might be constured as an indication of selection of some sort. The students were, in a sense, drafted into the room in which the questionnaire was administered, but each was given the choice of participating or not. Also, the questionnaire required no identification by the student. The name of each teacher, however, was known to the interviewer.

At no time was there any indication that this affected the teachers' responses to any serious degree. It is always possible, however, that the publicly expressed opinions are different from those privately held by the teachers or students.

The particular statistical measure used, the Kruskal-Goodman coefficient of rank order association has simplicity as a recommendation, but has not been adequately tested. The magnitude of the obtained correlations was generally low. However, it is our feeling that the individual correlations are of less significance for this study than the total pattern of behavior found in a school. A single item moderately or only slightly correlated with our index of damage may assume importance when seen in the context of the total accumulation of data. The consideration of the more or less regular association of a number of variables may provide understanding of the factors significant in the etiology of damage. An item not statistically significant by itself may assume significance when considered in relation to a series of other items.

Our conclusions must, therefore, be accepted within the limits of the methodology, sampling, and hypotheses of the study. On the basis of the correlations obtained in the analysis of the teacher interviews, the student questionnaires, the school data, and the histories of the schools, the following statements may be made about the relations between certain observed variables and the relative amount of damage in the sixteen schools in Syracuse which were studied.

Low socio-economic status and high instability of the community. In the school data it was shown that high damage rank is associated with low socio-economic status of the census tract in which the school is located, advanced age of the building, and low occupational status of fathers of students. There was an association observed between high damage rank and high rate of window breakage which occurs largely during the summer months when the school is not in session. These factors, taken together, suggest that such schools are located in areas of low social status and high physical deterioration. Two of our low socio-economic rank schools, however, do not have the expected high rates of damage. In the histories of the schools, our respondents stressed the transiency and instability of the area rather than the low socio-economic level of the community. It is very probable, therefore, that a low socio-economic level of the community, coupled with instability and a high rate of transiency is a characteristic of schools with high rates of damage. In such an unstable area the student is less likely to identify with the conventional values of education and of property than in a more stable and middle class neighborhood.

Change and instability in the school. It was pointed out in the school histories that change and instability in the school situation contributed to student and staff problems of adjustment. Frequent staff turnover, or change in a large segment of the staff at one time may disrupt the adequate functioning of the school, contributing to insecurity, restlessness, and low morale. A change in the school program, or the introduction of a new grade or class will create at least temporarily, some disturbances in the ordered relations between members of the school. Such changes, if rapid or extensive, may affect the use of common definitions of conduct in the school, increasing disorganization ahd the probability of deviant behavior by students.

Personal identification with the school. A relatively low level of interest in the academic program, and a relatively low degree of self identification with the school was characteristic of students in high damage schools. A moderately high positive correlation was obtained between damage rank of the school and the proportion of students in the school who were preparing for a job, rather than for college. Drop-out rates, at the legal age of 16 years, were strongly related to the damage rank of the school. The rate of truancy arrests, although correlated at a level just below our criterion of acceptance, is consistent with the conclusion that students in high damage schools have a low level of interest in education as compared with those in low damage schools. It was indicated in the school histories that dissatisfaction arose when students felt that the school curriculum did not meet their needs, or when it was felt that the school administration was not sufficiently concerned with welfare of students. Identification of these students with the school tended to be poor and participation in extracurricular activities limited by interest in cars or the necessity of carrying part time jobs while attending school. The relation of such students tends to become formal and perfunctory, with little personal identification with the values explicitly and implicitly associated with the educational institution.

become formal and perfunctory, with little personal identification with the

The lack of identification with the school by students in high damage schools is corroborated by the reports of students and teachers in these schools that the most significant factor in the causation of vandalism is an attitude of boredom in students. Such boredom might be a function of disinterest in school or a feeling of inappropriateness of the curriculum for the needs of the student. It may be, also, a result of the lack of rapport between students and teachers. Whichever of these alternative reasons is accepted, the result is the alienation from, or lack of identification of the student with, the school.

Moreover, students in high damage schools reported that they and their friends were casual and indifferent toward the school, in contrast to the feelings of enthusiasm and respect or pride reported by those in low damage schools. Student reports of feeling that their school was the poorest, or poorer than most, came proportionately more frequently from high damage schools. In such schools, students identified school loyalty with attendance at or participation in sports activities, while those in low damage schools spoke of "doing something" for the school. Reports from students in high damage schools were that they and their friends did nothing to improve their school, or that they actively did harm to the school.

Although a high proportion of teachers in all schools were alert to the problem of property damage, and were concerned about it, there appears to be a positive relation between high damage and alertness and concern by the teachers about it. On the other hand, teachers in low damage schools seemed to be more aware of the problem as it affected their particular school. Teachers in high damage schools identified damage as mainly occurring in classroom areas, while teachers in the other schools seemed to have an acquaintance with student conduct in all areas of the building and outside the building. Concern among all teachers was high, but teachers in low damage schools appeared to have a greater awareness of the location and extent of damage in their own schools. It appeared that teachers in high damage schools defined their roles in more limited terms than others. They seemed less well oriented and secure in their roles.

Teachers and parents in high damage schools also seem to have a lower degree of identification with the school than those in low damage schools. Analysis of the teacher interview responses indicated a positive correlation between damage rank and the proportion of teachers who seemed to have a casual or constructively critical attitude toward the school. They seemed to report enthusiasm for the school much less frequently than teachers in low damage schools. Students and teachers in high damage schools reported, much more frequently than in low damage schools, that the parents reported, much more frequently than in low damage schools, that the parents were disinterested in the school, that they were critical of the school, and that they regarded it unfavorably.

In the reasons given by teachers for differential damage in classrooms and in different schools we again see contrasts in the degree of personal identification of teachers in high and low damage schools, with the school. Those in high damage schools focussed their attention, to a much greater extent than did teachers in low damage schools, on the school administration, the age and location of the building, and poor teacher control in the classroom. Teachers in low damage schools emphasized, in their discussions, the role of the entire school staff, the age and grade of the students, student interest in school, and the experience of the teacher, as important factors determining the amount ard nature of damage in the school. It appears that teachers in high damage schools were more concerned with relatively impersonal factors in the school, while teachers in low damage schools were relatively more concerned with personal relations and effectiveness in role among teachers and students.

Analysis of the history data revealed that when identification of teachers or students with the school was weakened or lost, there was a loss in morale in the school. A break in the consensus of the staff, with the formation of cliques, will result in some deterioration of relations in the school. A lack of identification of the school as an integral part of the community structure will impede the assimilation by the students of the values and ideals of the educational system. Also, an unfavorable "reputation" or "modal personality structure" attached to the school, either because of events in the history of the school or because of adverse publicity being currently given to school events may prevent identification with the school or result in the alienation of some members of the staff and student body. Such alienation or lack of identification will decrease the effectiveness of the school norms in the control of conduct.

Administration and leadership. The level of administration and leadership was found to be differently reported in high and low damage schools. Teachers in low damage schools, in contrast to those in high damage schools reported that the administration in the school was democratic, strong or rigid. Reports from high damage schools were more frequently to the effect that the administration of the school was weak. Students also reported in high damage schools that the principal was weak in his administration and lax. The authoritarian nature of the school administration was repeated in the reports of students in high damage schools that they had little or no voice in planning school programs. In contrast, students in low damage schools reported that they met regularly with the principal and helped plan school programs.

students in low damage schools reported that they met regularly with the principal and helped plan school programs.

The school principal communicates to his staff and students the policies of his administration. It was seen in the school histories that where this communication was inadequate, or where there was a lack of clear definition of policy, teachers, and students were insecure in the roles they had to play. Where communication was purely formal and unilateral, where the school policy was arbitrarily determined by the principal, feelings of dissatisfaction were expressed by teachers and students. Where the orientation provided new personnel in the school -- principal, teachers, students -- did not clearly define the school policies and the roles of the various members of the school, a situation of insecurity was found.

It was stressed in the school histories that the principal needed, above all, to have a clear understanding of the needs of his students. This understanding should be expressed in a clearly perceived policy which should be administered fairly, firmly, and consistently. It was considered also to be the role of the principal to encourage teamwork among the staff, and set high standards of intellectual achievement for the students. With a firm, clearly expressed policy, embodying high standards of conduct and scholarship, adequately communicated to staff and students for their guidance, role anxiety is minimized and morale is maximized.

Interpersonal relations. The nature of the interpersonal relations in the school seemed to differ in high and low damage schools. Relations in high damage schools between various groups appeared to be more limited and more formal than those in low damage schools. Proportionately more reports were received from teachers in high damage schools that contacts between teachers were minimal and limited to matters of professional cooperation and the noon lunch period. Reports of unplanned or spontaneous social contact among teachers were found proportionately much more frequently in reports from teachers in low damage schools. High damage schools were also characterized by a minimum of contacts between teachers and parents.

Teacher-principal relations in high damage schools were reported to be on a much more formal level than those in low damage schools. It was indicated proportionately more frequently in high damage schools that interviews were initiated by the principal, whereas teachers in low damage schools reported an "open door" policy on the part of the principal, with interviews initiated by either teacher or principal.

Although most students felt that their teachers were moderately strict, those in low damage schools reported much more frequently that they created no special problems for substitute or supply teachers. High damage school students reported an unfavorable relation with the school custodian -- that he spied on them and reported them to the principal for acts of damage. Relations with peers, and with school counsellors, however, seemed to be more favorable in the high damage schools.

The personality of the principal was frequently mentioned as an important factor in school morale. Feelings of insecurity, anxiety or frustration in the principal were said to be communicated to members of his staff. Teachers who looked upon their work simply as a "job" were said to be unable to instil in their students a love of learning. The custodian who took his work seriously was able to communicate to students a conventional respect for property. Where school personnel were able to establish good rapport with students and communicate the approved conduct patterns to them conventional attitudes prevailed and destruction of property, as well as other norm violations, was low.

Welfare. Where students and parents feel that the welfare of the students is not being considered by the school administration, morale in the school and conformity to the school values will be low. It was indicated in interviews and in the school histories that where the curriculum did not meet the educational or vocational requirements of the students, dissatisfaction was high. Obsolescence of school apparatus, failure to repair broken equipment, overcrowding in classrooms, etc., were interpreted as a lack of interest of the administration in the welfare of students. Similarly, teachers working under adverse conditions, with no amelioration of these conditions by the principal, the custodian, or the Board of Education, were reported to feel deeply frustrated. Conformity to the values of the school administration, when it is felt by students and staff that this administration is not concerned with their welfare, will be minimal. Resentment would be expressed by students overtly, against the tangible aspects - the physical plant and equipment - of the school.

The problem of this study was to adduce a pattern of regularities or common elements in the organization and social structure of a school which might be associated with acts of property damage committed by students of the school. Correlations were obtained between ranks on a series of selected socio-psychological variables and rank of each of the sixteen schools on a damage rating. Low socio-economic status and high instability or transiency in the community in which the school was located, and change and instability in the school situation were found related to the relative amount of school damage. A low level of personal identification with the school and its goals among students, teachers, and parents was found positively associated with a high rate of vandalic behavior among students. High damage schools, also, were found characterized by inadequate administration and leadership, with poor communication among the various members of the school. In such schools, furthermore, relatively poor interpersonal relations were found between principal and teacher, teacher and teacher, student and teacher, parent and teacher, and custodian and student. The feeling that the school administration was not sufficiently concerned with the welfare of staff and students was found associated with a low level of school morale.

It must be recognised that probably no school will exhibit all the factors found positively associated with high damage and low morale. On the other hand, no school will be completely free of any of these items. Also, the presence of an unsalutory factor or item may be effectively counteracted by strength in another area. It is probable, therefore, that the presence in the school of a preponderance of damage-related factors over wholesome factors may provide a fertile soil for vandalism.

Discussion and Implications for Educators

The existence of property damage in a school, committed by members of the student body, suggests that the students' internalization of the societal prescriptions with respect to the care and use of property is somehow deficient. It implies that the school, along with other social institutions charged with the responsibility for the socialization of the child, has somehow failed to impress on him a concern for one of the strong middle class values of our society, that of property. It would seem that the socialization of the child, the process of the imposition of the conventional values and norms of conduct on the child, has been in some manner defective. Moreover, it would appear that the school has failed to duly impress the child with the particular value it represents, that of education. There appears, then, in the problem of school property destruction, a dual gap in the socialization process with respect to the transmission of the values of education and of property.

Since there are no formal techniques commonly in use for teaching respect for property we focussed on the informal aspects of the socialization process in the school. We attempted in the analysis of the data to use categories of behavior or relationships which would have significance for educators and for students. These categories, moreover, are of importance in the operation of any social institution. The implications of our findings, therefore, may be easily seen in a consideration of the variables discussed in our conclusions.

Teachers and school administrators will very probably find in these conclusions many implications for their work not apparent to a social science researcher not trained in the art of education. Indeed, it appears to us that the findings of this study have implications for all phases of school relationships, and not for vandalism alone.

The school as a social system. The school, considered as a social system, has a technology, a set of rules of conduct governing the relations between members of the society, and an ideology or value system guiding the conduct of its constituent members. The organization of the group usually includes patterns of both formal and informal relations. It involves a series of structured behavior patterns or roles, in which various statuses are attached.

In the group behavior are involved processes of communication, initiation, division of labor, etc. As an institution it may be oriented toward the fulfillment of a limited task, or toward the fulfillment of the needs of the members of the group, or both.

Organization of certain kinds produces strains or maladjustments in a social system. An excess of bureaucratization, in which the rules become ends in their own right rather than means, will create strains in the institution. A society in which formal relations predominate, or in which communication between members is limited, will develop maladjustments among its constituents.

Where identification of large segments of the society with the values or goals of the society is lacking, either by choice or through a situation of anomie, consensus and cooperation are impeded. Or, where the roles or values are unclear or in conflict, strains in the interpersonal relations will appear. Under circumstances where involvement of the various members of the society in shared tasks is low, or where primary group relationships are minimal, the social structure will be characterized by weakness and instability.

The role played by the leader is significant in the determination of the interpersonal relations in the society. In the school he might be task oriented - focussing on the efficient and formal discharge of the prescribed duties of the institution. He might be, at the other extreme, strongly oriented toward providing for the welfare of the members of the institution. His orientation would determine the nature of the relations or degree of identification of the individual members with the group. The nature of the authority asserted by the principal - whether it be based on mere incumbency in office on true expertise, or on earned respect or prestige because of skill in discharging his duties as an educator and administrator - will affect his relations with his staff. His attitudes would tend to pattern the relations between other members of the school. Another duty of the administrator lies in the development of bonds between the school and the community as well as bonds between the various members of the school.

The stability of the school as a society will depend on the degree to which the various role players within it conform to one another's expectations. Changes, both planned and unplanned, leave consequences for the entire system. These consequences may be intended or unanticipated. Changes in or uncertainty of roles, or in the goal orientation of the members may bring about maladjustment in the ordered relations of the various role incumbents. The security of teachers and students is threatened by the inability to predict behavior of their colleagues or the principal.

It appears that many of the circumstances or events generally associated with situations of societal strain or maladjustment were found, in our research, to be characteristic of schools with high damage ratings. Community instability and change, which was found associated with damage in schools, involves an alteration in the value placed on formal education, and a modification in the nature of the relations between students and teachers, and between the school and the community. A continuation of the existing school program with no concern for the modification in community needs or interests will tax the community-school relations.

Change and instability will disturb the school by deranging the existing established pattern of relationships between principal, teachers, and students. Goals become confused and roles lose their clear definition. Leadership may be weakened. With the introduction of a number of new personnel at one time the job of integrating these into the existing formal and informal structure of the school becomes crucial. A disturbance of the sex ratio among teachers will create problems of interpersonal relations in the teachers' lounge as well as in the classroom. A new principal, bringing with him techniques applicable in another school may find himself involved in a series of unanticipated problems. Change in the school curriculum, or the introduction of a new group of students will cause at least a temporary derangement of the established behavior patterns among students.

Weakness of personal identification with the school may accompany a lack of involvement of members of the school in common tasks. The unilateral development of rules by the principal, with no participation by teachers or students will limit identification with the school. Lacking free communication between members of the school, cooperative activity by teachers, students and parents with respect to the goals of the institution is impeded. The proper orientation of principal, teachers, and students in their respective roles is essential for the orderly discharge of these roles vis à vis each other. The involvement of parents in school programs and in the determination of policies, by the principal, is essential for identification of the parents with the school.

The administration and leadership of the school determines, to a large extent, the nature of the interpersonal and academic relations. A leader who is task oriented may, in his zeal to accomplish the execution of the formal job of education, create strains among his colleagues and students, by ignoring their personal welfare needs. A principal whose authority is based merely on his incumbency in office rather than skill as an educator, intellectual ability or personality, will not evoke responses of confidence or loyalty from his staff or students. A principal who does not clearly communicate and consistently apply policies of his administration, or his educational philosophy, will create anxiety and insecurity among his staff. Failing to set academic and behavior standards for the school, the principal may develop a staff and student body lacking in consensus and adequate definitions of conduct.

An institution characterized by an authoritarian,formal organization will be characterized by a low level of interpersonal relations among its members. Such a school will call out little loyalty among its staff and students, and a low level of identification with the school. Where spontaneous interpersonal relations are frequent, identification with the school, and morale, are high. A high degree of formality in contacts is associated with a low level of self-identification as a member of the school.

The feeling, among staff and students, that the administration is lacking in concern for their welfare results in dissatisfaction and insecurity. A bureaucratic administration or an autocratic rather than democratic leadership, task oriented rather than welfare oriented, will not gain the enthusiastic support of the school. Group maintenance is as important in a society as the efficient discharge of the assigned tasks. Where the teachers feel that the principal is more concerned about the feelings of the community than the welfare of the school staff their allegiance will be withheld.

Implications for Educators. Communities change and in a fairly predictable way. Since community instability and change were found significantly related to the amount of damage in the school, the school should be located where these would be minimized. The school curriculum should be kept abreast of changes in the composition of the student population and should be attuned to the needs of the students. Teachers should be aware of changes in the interests of the students and should receive aid, possibly through an in-service training program, in adjusting classroom procedures to better benefit the new students. Leadership should be supplied by the principal in the adjustment of the school program to the new students.

Rapid or frequent change in program, administrative procedures or routines, should be avoided. Change was seen as disturbing the ordered relations between individuals and groups, producing strains in the school organization. When changes in several areas of the school program or organization take place at one time, without proper adjustment of the personnel involved, the strains created may lead to serious disruptions in the operation of the school.

Proper orientation of principal, teachers and students with respect to the policies and routines of the school will eliminate some of the anxiety regarding the fulfillment of role obligation. Furthermore, there should be easy two-way communication between all levels of school personnel. Lack of opportunity to communicate may be frustrating and anxiety producing. Such opportunities might be provided in student government or faculty meetings. A matter which seriously disturbed many teachers was that the results of their disciplinary referrals to the principal were not communicated back to them. An involvement of the teacher in the principal's decision would give the teacher a sense of participation in the administration of the school.

Students, parents, and teachers should be actively involved, through the leadership of the principal, in various school activities. Parents should be given the opportunity to get to know the teachers of their children, and to know the policies of the school administration. A closer identification of parents with the school will add to the better identification of their children with the school values and norms. Communication between parents and the school might serve to correct discrepancies between the educational objectives of the parents and students and that of the school administration, enabling the school to better serve the community. Friction would be minimized and understanding increased with improved communication, lessening aggressive behavior arising out of frustration.

Since the principal is the key figure in determining school policy and the administration of that policy, careful selection of the principal is essential. Care should be taken to see that his personality, educational philosophy, training ability as a leader, are adequate for the job he will be called upon to do. He should be carefully oriented with respect to the community which he is to serve, and the faculty with which he has to work. He should be aware of the policies under which the school has operated previously.

Interpersonal relations in the school should be structured so as to increase identification of teachers, students and parents, with the school. Contacts, informal as well formal, should be stimulated for better understanding of the goals of the school. Frequent and spontaneous social contacts between teachers decreases social distance and increases cooperation by facilitating communication and a sharing of experiences. Warm personal contacts between teachers and students may serve to increase the student's identification with the goals of the school and the value of education. Socialization among teachers may be facilitated by a teachers room. Contacts between teachers, students and parents may be increased by participation in extra curricular activities sponsored by the administration.

In the administration of the school it is essential that the welfare of students and teachers be considered along with the formal task of education. Students or teachers who feel that the principal or the administration is not interested in their comfort and happiness, as well as the development of their intellects, will develop little feeling for the school. The staff, students and also parents must be shown that the principal is actively attempting to get for them from the Board of Education adequate working conditions, books, equipment, etc.

Thus community change, changes in the school program, student population and staff, the personal identification of students and staff with the school, administrative leadership, degree and type of interpersonal relationships and the extent to which the welfare needs of staff and students are felt satisfied have been seen related to disorganization of personal relations in the school and to vandalism. More concern with community changes and the organization of the school to meet the implications of these changes, will prevent disruption of school - community relations. Disruption caused by rapid or extensive changes of personnel or routine in the school should be minimized. Identification of the members of the school with the school, its goals and values should be enhanced by improved communication of roles and participation in school programs. Leadership should foster improved interpersonal relations and concern for the welfare of school personnel as well as for the task of education.

Bibliography

Brookover, Wilbur A., A Sociology of Education. N. Y., American Book Co., 1955.

Dahlke, H. Otto, Values in Culture and Classroom. N. Y., Harper & Bros., 1958.

Gouldner, Alvin W., Organizational Analysis. In Sociology Today, edited by Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., N. Y., Basic Books Inc., 1960.

Gross, Neal, The Sociology of Education. In Sociology Today, edited by Robert K. Merton, et al. N. Y., Basic Books Inc., 1960.

Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. N. Y., Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Olmsted, Michael S., The Small Group. N. Y., Random House, 1959.

Rodehaver, Myles W., William B. Axtell, and Richard E. Gross, The Sociology of the School. N. Y., Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1957.

APPENDIX A

School Building Property Damage

Evaluative Checklist*

A. Instructions.

In evaluating the property damage evident in a school building three basic criteria must be considered. They are (1) frequency of damage, (2) intent to damage, and (3) severity of damage. These criteria are explained herein as background for the use of the accompanying checklist designed for use in evaluating school building property damage.

Frequency of Damage

Frequency of property damage as one of the criteria of the amount of property damage in a school building may be considered in three phases. The first aspect to be considered is the frequency of evidence of one kind of damage in a section of the building. Examples of this phase which may be cited by way of explanation are the number of splintered chairs in the auditorium, the number of gouged desks in a classroom, or the number of broken or bent doors on lavatory stalls. Frequency of such damage could potentially range from no such damage or a few evidences of damage in a low-property-damage area of the building to evidence that a clear majority of the desks, or chairs, or doors had been damaged in a high-property-damage area.

Frequency may be further interpreted as the number of distinctly different kinds of property damage in evidence in a particular section of the school. In a low-property-damage classroom the damage might be confined to a few desks with little or no other damage in evidence. In a high-property-damage classroom desks, bulletin boards and walls might be marred or gouged in addition to desk chairs being loosened from the floor or broken, window shades torn, and fixtures such as pencil sharpeners broken.

The third phase of frequency is applicable where more than one similar area is located in the building. That is, where there are several classrooms, lavatories, locker rooms, laboratories, shops, or art rooms in the building, the number of such areas showing evidence of damage must be considered. If damage is limited to one classroom, lavatory or similar unit this represents an amount of property damage at the low end of the scale in contrast to evidence of property damage in a majority or all classrooms, lavatories or similar units representing the high end of the scale.

The combined effect of the three phases of frequency may be interpreted as an overall frequency of property damage for a school building. This overall frequency is one criterion for determining the extent of property damage evident in the building.

Intent to Damage

The clear premeditated intent to damage school property must be considered among the criteria for evaluating the magnitude of property damage evident in a building. This is to eliminate from consideration all damage which is normal wear and tear resulting from use of facilities. Examples of wear-and-tear damage are scuffed woodwork, spattered walls in the paint area of the wood shop, marred work tables or benches where pupils use tools, frayed telephone cords, cracked or peeling paint, tears along seams of gymnasium mats at the points where they are hung on the wall.

---

* This device was designed and herein described by Mr. Robert G. Bickel, Instructor, School of Education, Syracuse University.

At the same time, a clear definition of the kinds of evidence to be considered intentional must be given. To this end, some examples of intentional damage which may be cited are broken desk tops, splintered auditorium seats, broken or bent lavatory doors, missing hardware in sinks, and gouged bulletin boards.

For purposes of the kind of evaluation proposed in the accompanying checklist any writing on the surfaces of furniture, doors or wall surfaces will be considered intentional damage. It is recognized that the severity of such damage may vary. This consideration is treated in the explanation of severity as a criterion of damage.

Severity of Damage.

Another essential criterion of the extent of school building property damage is the seriousness of the evidences of such damage as noted by an evaluator. He may equate severity of damage with his estimate of (1) the ease of repair or replacement of the objects or areas damaged and/or (2) the cost of such repair or replacement. Using the defacing of walls as an example, the following list might represent a continuum of severity, from least to most severe:

1. Finger marks on the wall.
2. Pencil marks on the wall which may be washed off.
3. Crayon marks on the wall requiring a solvent to remove them.
4. Lipstick marks on the wall requiring a solvent and other cleaning agents to completely remove them..
5. Scratched marks on the wall requiring repair.
6. Lipstick marks over scratches on the wall requiring cleaning agents and repair to restore the surface.
7. Gouged marks in the wall requiring more extensive repair or replacement of the surface.

For purposes of the definition of severity presented here, the estimation of severity must not be associated with a moral judgment. That is, evidence such as vulgarisms on walls is considered no more severe than other marks on the walls and may be less severe if it may be removed easily.

To further clarify these evaluative criteria, the various parts of a school building are outlined below in a manner to define the extremes of property damage as seen in each of the areas. The descriptions are oriented to the frequency criterion. The reader (and user of the checklist) should bear in mind that although an area may not have all of the evidences of damage outlined, such damage as exists may indicate a degree of intent and severity as to require a high damage rating.

AUDITORIUM

High Property Damage	Low Property Damage
1. A majority of the seats are marked. 2. Some seats are broken or missing.	1. Damage to seats is isolated or non-existent.

AUDITORIUM

High Property Damage

3. The walls are marked and/or gouged.
4. The woodwork is marked.
5. The stage curtains show some damage.
6. The doors providing entrance to the auditorium are marked.
7. Some window shades are torn.

Low Property Damage

2. Marking on walls, doors, and woodwork is non-existent, infrequent, and/or easily removed.
3. The stage curtains show no damage.
4. The window shades show no damage.

CORRIDORS
BASEMENT AREAS

High Property Damage

1. A majority of the wall space and/or woodwork shows marking ranging from pencil marks to gouging.
2. Doors to rooms show marking and/or have name plates or other hardware showing damage.
3. Some of the bulletin boards are marked.
4. Some of the drinking fountains are marked and/or missing hardware.
5. In each group of lockers there are a few bent doors, or locks are missing, or intentional scratches are evident.

Low Property Damage

1. Marking on walls, woodwork is isolated. Marking may be removed easily.
2. Doors to rooms show no damage.
3. Bulletin boards are unmarked.
4. Drinking fountains show no damage.
5. Damage to lockers is limited to marking which may be removed easily.

CAFETERIA

High Property Damage

1. Tables and/or chairs show evidence of splintering, marking, or disassembling (bolts or hardware removed).
2. Walls, woodwork, and/or doors show marking.
3. Serving rails show evidence of being jimmied and/or disassembled.

Low Property Damage

1. Tables and/or chairs show no damage which cannot be easily cleaned.
2. Walls, woodwork, and/or doors show no marking which cannot be cleaned easily.
3. Serving rails show no damage.

CLASSROOMS
LABORATORIES

In evaluating classrooms or laboratories consider the proportion of them which fit the descriptions below. If a large number of them show high-property-damage traits, a rating of high damage is warranted. Similarly, a high proportion of low-property-damage rooms signifies a rating of low damage. Frequency, severity, and intent represent criteria for intermediate ratings.

(See Outlines on Next Page)

CLASSROOMS
LABORATORIES

High Property Damage

1. A majority of the desks or tables show evidence of damage such as gouged tops, broken hinges, or disassembly.
2. Some chairs or seats show evidence of damage such as loosened attachment to the floor, disassembly, gouging, or broken parts.
3. Walls, woodwork, bulletin board surfaces show marking and/or gouging.
4. Doors show marking, gouging, or damaged hardware.
5. Cupboards (and tops), bookcases, or ledges show some marking.
6. Displays, posters, or other teaching aids show some marking, and/or damage.

Low Property Damage

1. Desks show marking but no gouging, broken hinges, or disassembly.
2. Chairs or seats show occasional marking but no disassembly, loosened floor attachment, gouging, or breakage.
3. Walls, woodwork, and bulletin boards show no marking.
4. Doors are undamaged.
5. Cupboards, bookcases, and ledges show no marking.
6. Teaching aids show no marking or damage.

HOMEMAKING ROOMS

High Property Damage

1. Walls, woodwork, or bulletin board surfaces show defacement.
2. Work areas, tables, sewing machines are marked, gouged, or similarly defaced.
3. Some cupboards have loosened hinges, or hardware.
4. Garbage and trash disposal containers are bent or missing hardware.
5. Paper towel dispensers are loosened from the wall or scratched.

Low Property Damage

1. Walls, woodwork, or bulletin board surfaces are unmarked.
2. Work areas show marking which may be removed easily.
3. Cupboards show no damage.
4. Dispensers and disposal containers show no damage.

EXTERNAL BUILDING
GROUNDS

High Property Damage

1. All walls of the building show marking, and/or damage at ground level.
2. Some damage is evident on walls of the building above ground level (i.e. requiring climbing to accomplish).
3. The entrances to the building, and the doors show marking and/or damage.
4. Window breakage is evident at each floor level, in all walls.

Low Property Damage

1. Walls show marking which may be easily removed.
2. No marking or damage is evident above ground level.
3. Entrances and doors show marking which may be easily removed.
4. Window breakage is evident in isolation (e.g. one window at one floor level in two walls of the building.).
5. Sidewalks, and/or retaining walls show isolated marking and no damage.

EXTERNAL BUILDING GROUNDS

High Property Damage

5. Sidewalks, and/or ground retaining walls show marking and damage.
6. Fences are bent, or fence poles are bent or uprooted.
7. Lawn or hedges, if present, show uprooting and/or trampling.

Low Property Damage

6. Fences and fenceposts show no evidences of damage.
7. Lawns or hedges, if present, show no trampling or uprooting.

GYMNASIUMS

In evaluating damage to the gymnasium, consider evidence secured in locker-shower rooms as well as evidence secured in the gymnasium itself.

Locker - Shower Rooms

High Property Damage

1. Walls, bulletin board surfaces, or woodwork show evidence of defacement.
2. Lockers are scratched, have bent doors or sides, or have locks or hardware missing.
3. Benches are gouged or show evidence of disassembly.
4. Doors are defaced and/or have damaged or missing hardware.
5. Mirrors are scratched and/or broken.
6. Some plumbing hardware is missing.
7. Paper dispensers are defaced or missing.

Low Property Damage

1. Walls, woodwork, bulletin board surfaces show evidence of marking which may be removed easily.
2. Lockers show similar marking but no damage.
3. Benches show similar marking but no other damage.
4. Doors show no damage.
5. Mirrors are unmarked.
6. Plumbing, hardware, dispensers show no damage.

Main Gymnasium

High Property Damage

1. Walls, woodwork, or bulletin board surfaces are marked.
2. Benches are gouged or show evidence of disassembly.
3. Equipment (e.g. mats) shows intentional marking or damage.

Low Property Damage

1. Walls, woodwork, bulletin boards, and benches are unmarked.
2. Equipment is unmarked.

LAVATORIES

As in the case of classrooms, in evaluating lavatories consider the proportion of them which fit the descriptions below before rating them as high or low in property damage. Consider both boys' and girls' lavatories.

High Property Damage

1. Walls and wall surfaces adjoining toilets are scratched, gouged or marked with lipstick.

Low Property Damage

1. Walls and wall surfaces adjoining toilets are marked in a manner which can be cleaned readily.

3.

LAVATORIES

High Property Damage

2. Doors on toilet stalls are bent, gouged, or missing hardware. Some of the doors have been removed.
3. Metal pipes forming the structure for the toilet stalls are bent or missing.
4. Pipes supplying water to toilets have been bent.
5. Mirrors are scratched, broken or missing.
6. Dispensers (soap and paper) are loosened from the wall or missing.
7. Entrance doors are marked, gouged, or missing hardware.

Low Property Damage

2. All the doors on toilet stalls are present and, if marked, are marked in a manner which can be cleaned readily.
3. Hardware and pipes are intact.
4. Mirrors are unmarked.
5. Entrance doors are unmarked.

LIBRARY

High Property Damage

1. Walls, woodwork, and bulletin board surfaces are marked.
2. Tables, chairs, bookshelves, and cardfiles show evidence of defacement.
3. Reference books (e.g. dictionaries, encyclopedias) show evidence of defacement.

Low Property Damage

1. Wall surfaces and furniture are free of marking.
2. References are free of marking.

SHOPS
ARTS AND CRAFTS ROOMS

Consider the proportion of these rooms which show the characteristics described below before making an evaluative judgment of property damage.

High Property Damage

1. Work areas show evidences of gouging, holes, and similar damage not attributable to the work done in the area (e.g. names carved into surfaces).
2. Wall surfaces show evidence of gouging.
3. Tool and materials storage areas show evidence of defacement and disassembly.
4. Paint areas show evidence of deliberate spattering (e.g. spattering high on the wall and ceiling).
5. Tools are unduly marked, gouged, or nicked.
6. Doors are gouged or have hardware missing.

Low Property Damage

1. Work areas show no evidences of damage not attributable to the work done in the area.
2. Wall surfaces show no evidence of defacement.
3. Tool and materials storage areas show evidence of marking but no disassembly.
4. Paint areas show no evidence of deliberate spattering.
5. Tools are free of marks or nicks.
6. Doors are free of marking or evidence of disassembly.

SCHOOL BUILDING PROPERTY DAMAGE

EVALUATIVE CHECKLIST

B. Damage Rating.

Introduction

This checklist is designed for use in evaluating the nature and extent of property damage evident in school buildings. The evaluation is one of comparison of buildings since the checklist does not result in an absolute value (e.g. cost of repair or replacement). A copy of the checklist must be used in several school buildings in order to secure a relative property-damage rating for a single building.

Use of the checklist

Using the checklist to structure observation, the evaluator should take about one hour to look at all areas of the building. The pacing of the observation should be such that the placing of disproportionate emphasis on a few areas in or around the building is avoided.

Below are listed the parts of a school building and its grounds which the observer should evaluate for property damage. Under each of these heading there is a sublist showing places where property damage occurs. Space is left for notations about these areas.

Look at each part of the school building listed. Make notations on this form concerning evidence of property damage. In the light of these notations, indicate the extent of property damage in the space provided after each heading (e.g. Corridors) using the following scale:

Property damage in this part of the school is
5. high
4. relatively high
3. moderate
2. relatively low
1. low

Total the scores for the headings for a total property damage score and enter this total in the space indicated at the end of the form.

AUDITORIUM ______

1. seats
2. floor
3. stage floor
4. stage curtains
5. walls
6. woodwork
7. electrical fixtures, outlets, controls
8. doors
9. other

BASEMENT AREAS

1. plumbing
2. walls
3. storage rooms
4. locker space
5. floors
6. doors
7. other

CAFETERIA

1. furniture: tables, chairs
2. floors
3. woodwork
4. electrical fixtures, outlets
5. serving counter, rails
6. walls
7. drinking fountain
8. doors
9. other

CLASSROOMS

1. floors
2. desks: top, seat, storage areas, ink well
3. teacher's desk
4. walls
5. heating, plumbing
6. tables
7. bookcases
8. woodwork
9. electrical fixtures, outlets
10. window ledges
11. lockers
12. doors
13. cupboards, cupboard tops
14. bulletin boards, blackboards, chalk trays
15. telephone
16. other

CORRIDORS

1. floors
2. doors
3. walls
4. lockers
5. drinking fountains
6. woodwork
7. electrical fixtures and outlets
8. bulletin boards
9. telephone booths
10. other

EXTERNAL BUILDING ________

1. walls
2. windows
3. entrances
4. doors
5. electrical fixtures, outlets
6. other

GROUNDS ________

1. lawn, hedges, trees
2. sidewalks
3. drives
4. fences
5. other

PLAYGROUND ________

1. fences
2. equipment
    a. swings, slides, see saws
    b. backstops, goal posts
3. bike racks
4. other

GYMNASIUMS ________

1. locker rooms
    a. mirrors
    b. benches
    c. floors
    d. walls
    e. plumbing
    f. lockers
    g. electrical devices
    h. doors
    i. other

2. shower rooms
    a. floors
    b. walls
    c. plumbing
    d. doors
    e. other

3. equipment: apparatus, balls, etc.
4. floors
5. walls
6. woodwork
7. electrical fixtures, outlets
8. benches
9. other

HOMEMAKING ROOMS

1. tables, work areas
2. stoves, refrigerators, sewing machines etc.
3. plumbing
4. storage areas
5. walls
6. floors
7. woodwork
8. electrical fixtures, outlets.
9. materials
10. towel dispenser
11. telephone
12. garbage disposal containers
13. bulletin boards, blackboards
14. other

LABORATORIES, SCIENCE ROOMS

1. Tables, work areas
2. plumbing
3. equipment
4. materials: chemicals, rocks, plants
5. storage areas
6. walls
7. floors
8. woodwork
9. electrical devices, fixtures, outlets
10. blackboard, bulletin board
11. displays
12. telephone
13. other

LAVATORIES

1. plumbing
2. walls, stalls
3. floors
4. mirrors
5. soap dispensers
6. paper towel dispensers
7. toilet tissue dispensers
8. trash containers
9. electrical fixtures, outlets
10. doors
11. other

LIBRARY

1. books
2. furniture: tables, librarian's desk
3. book shelves
4. floor
5. walls
6. woodwork
7. electrical fixtures, outlets
8. card file
9. other

SHOPS, ARTS AND CRAFTS ROOMS

1. benches, work areas
2. tool racks
3. storage areas
4. tools and equipment
5. walls
6. floors
7. woodwork
8. electrical devices, fixtures, outlets
9. plumbing
10. materials
11. bulletin boards, blackboards
12. doors
13. other

TEACHING MATERIALS

1. audio-visual equipment
2. textbooks
3. business machines
4. other

TOTAL SCHOOL ________

APPENDIX B

Teacher Interview Questions

1. From your personal knowledge what can you tell us about property damage by children? What experiences have you had concerning such damage?
2. In your opinion, why do children do such things?
3. What sort of things do children do that cost the city money? To the school? To the class-room?
4. In what parts of the building does property damage occur? Why?
5. At what time of day or year is property damage more likely to occur? Why?
6. What kinds of children commit property damage on basis of your experience? Age? Sex? Race? Nationality? Ability? Social Status? Economic condition? What kind of children give you most trouble?
7. Are there student cliques in your school? Does property damage occur in cliques? Are there cliques in your room? How are they identified?
8. What do you know about the home situation of the children in this school? Kind of homes they come from? Sort of parents?
9. What is the parents' attitude toward education? How do they feel toward the school?
10. What about the PTA? Mothers Club? What responsibilities do you have in it? How often does it meet? How often do you attend?
11. Why, in your opinion, do some schools have much and others have little property damage? How does this school compare with others in property damage? Does this school have more now than in past years? Why?
12. What should a teacher do in case of property damage by a child?
13. Have you noticed a change in the amount of property damage in your room in the last several years? Why are some rooms damaged more than others?
14. What sort of contacts do the teachers here have with each other? In the Teachers' Lounge? Social contacts? Outside contacts? Parties? Teacher principal contacts? Meetings?
15. What about communication between teachers and administration? Are faculty meetings productive? Democratic?

16. What extra curricular activities are you responsible for? Were you assigned or did you volunteer for these?

17. In your opinion, has property damage been increasing or decreasing? Why?

18. How do pupils feel about the school? What is the level of school spirit among the students?

19. What, in your opinion, should be done about property damage?

20. Who is responsible for discipline in your school?

21. What do you consider to be the role of the teacher in the school?

APPENDIX C

Analysis of Teacher Interviews

I. Attitude toward School Property Damage

1. Unconcerned - (doesn't know)
2. Casual Acceptance (indifferent)
3. Limited Concern
4. Alert and Concerned

II. Knowledge of Property Damage (This School)

1. Completely ignorant of damage
2. Hearsay
3. Aware of Damage
4. Keenly aware

III. Location of Damage (This School)

1. Own room
2. Other classrooms
3. Corridors
4. Lavatories
5. Other parts of building (inside or out, auditorium, equipment etc.)
6. Lockers and locker rooms
7. Windows

IV. Direction of Blame for Property Damage (Any School)

1. Teacher
2. Staff: (Teachers, principal, special teachers, custodian)
3. Organization of the school
4. Outside of Teaching: Building, Evening Classes, Summer School, Location of Room, etc.
5. Within the child - (Elaborated in V)

6. Outside of School: Community, Families, History of School, etc.
7. City-wide Administrative Organization. (Supplies, Superintendent, Assignment of teachers, principals, custodians, supervisory, zoning, etc.)

V. Why Children Damage Property

1. Bored (not interested, marking time)
2. Pre-occupation, doodling
3. For fun
4. Status: recognition, attention
5. Peer group collective behavior
6. Pent-up energy, restless, nothing to do
7. Revenge (resentment vs. teacher, school, etc.)

VI. Kind of Children who Damage Property

1. Sex
2. Age or Grade
3. Race or Nationality
4. Socio-economic status
5. Ability (or lack of)
6. Inadequate home training
7. Broken homes
8. Problem of transition (Jr. Hi. to Hi. etc.)
9. Doesn't know

VII. Teacher's Familiarity with Parents

1. No contact: Has not met parents
2. Hearsay
3. Children as source (themes, talk)
4. Open House
5. School functions, PTA, (seems to know parents)
6. Call parents to discuss child problems
7. Personal Contacts, PTA, ECA - Good rapport.

VIII. Teacher's Evaluation of Parent Attitude

1. Doesn't know parents' attitude
2. Parents actively oppose the school
3. Parents resent school and education (but do or say nothing)
4. Parents lack information
5. Parents indifferent (not interested)
6. Parents interested and cooperative
7. Excessive interest (interference)

IX. Why Some Schools have more Property Damage

1. Deny difference
2. Physical location of school
3. Type of Neighborhood
4. Community Attitude
5. Size of School
6. Age and Condition of building and equipment
7. Administration
8. Teachers' Attitude (teamwork or lack of)
9. Students' Attitude
10. Age and/or grades in school (Elementary, Jr. or Sr. Hi.)
11. Custodian
12. Doesn't know

X. Why Classrooms Differ in Amount of Property Damage

1. Deny differences
2. Size of classes
3. Subject taught (elective - required)
4. Age of pupils
5. Interest of pupils
6. Ability of pupils
7. Age and experience of teacher

8. Teacher attitude and discipline
9. "Floating" teacher
10. No teacher identified with room (study, hall, etc.)
11. Doesn't know

XI. What to Do in Case of Property Damage

1. Ignore or do nothing
2. Clean up, repair, refer to custodian with no further issue made of it
3. Teacher handle it.
4. Report child to school authority (Principal, counselor)
5. Report to Police or Outside Authority

XII. How Should Vandalism Be Treated

1. Pupil work to repair and pay (learn value and prevent repetition)
2. Pupil pay for damage
3. Have parents pay
4. Punish offender (Principal, teacher)
5. Punish by outside authority (Police)

XIII. Teacher Contacts in The School

1. No contact
2. Minimal contacts (faculty meetings only)
3. Professional help, team work
4. Lunch room
5. Social gatherings planned (parties, coffee hours, etc.)
6. Social gatherings spontaneous (lounge, etc.)
7. Outside contacts with co-workers

XIV. Principal Availability or Contacts with Teachers (This School)

1. Formal Contacts
2. Initiated by Principal, only occasionally by teacher
3. Initiated by either principal or teacher

4. Open-door police

XV. Pupils' Attitude Toward School (This School)

1. Enthusiastic
2. Proud
3. Respect school
4. Casual - "It's O.K."
5. Indifferent
6. Resentment - Hate School

XVI. School Administration

1. Strict - totalitarian type, rigid
2. Democratic: Strong leadership
3. Permissive - Casual
4. Indifferent
5. Weak - leadership lacking
6. Doesn't know

XVII. Teacher's Attitude Toward the School

1. Enthusiastic
2. Constructively Critical
3. Indifferent - Casual
4. Destructively critical

XVIII. Role of the Teacher

1. Teach subject matter
2. Guidance, discipline
3. Teach good citizenship
4. An adult friend to pupil
5. Parent substitute
6. Doesn't know
7. Miscellaneous other

APPENDIX D

Pupil Questionnaire

School ______________________________ Age ____________________________

Grade: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 Boy _________ Girl _________

Directions

1. Do not turn this page until you are told to.
2. Syracuse University is doing a study of property damage in the junior and senior high schools of Syracuse for the U. S. Office of Education. It is important for us to have your honest opinion in reply to every question on this questionnaire.

   DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME

   No one will know how you answer a question.

   This is not a test nor an examination. There are no right or wrong answers. We need to know how you think or feel about these questions.
3. At the top of this page, fill in the name of your school and your age. Circle the grade you are in. Check whether you are a boy or a girl.
4. Now we are ready for the questions. The supervisor will read each question aloud and you will follow it on your paper. After he has read the whole of each question, you will draw a circle around the one answer that most nearly describes how you feel. In most questions you are to encircle only one answer - the one that most nearly describes how you feel about it.

Pupil Questionnaire

Encircle only one answer.

A. Why do you go to school? (circle only One)

1. I go to school because it is compulsory until I'm 16.
2. I go because there's nothing else to do.
3. I go because my parents want me to finish high school.
4. I am preparing for a job.
5. I am preparing for college.

B. How does your school compare with other schools?

1. My school is the best in the city in every way.
2. My school is better than most schools in the city.
3. My school is just as good as other schools.
4. My school is poorer than most.
5. My school is the poorest in the city.

C. How do you get along with the other pupils in your school?

1. Most kids are very friendly. I feel accepted.
2. Most kids are friendly part of the time.
3. The kids are sort of indifferent. They ignore me.
4. The kids are unfriendly or snobbish.
5. The pupils are malicious and mean to me. (I feel left out.)

D. How do you and your friends feel about your school?

1. We are enthusiastic about it. It's the best!
2. We are proud of it. It's a good school.
3. It's O. K. We respect it.
4. We are bored with school.
5. We resent it - we hate school.

E. What do you do when you hear people criticize or say bad things about your school?

1. It makes me angry (mad).
2. I speak up for my school and tell them they're wrong.
3. I just listen and do nothing.
4. I agree with them.
5. I tell them what I think is bad, too.

F. When you hear people talk about school loyalty, what do you think it means?

1. School loyalty means doing something for the school.
2. School loyalty means attending or taking part in sport and/or other activities.
3. It means getting good grades.
4. It means being faithful to people such as teachers, the principal, coach, etc.
5. School loyalty is being true to tradition or what the school stands for.

G. Do the pupils work to make your school better?

1. Pupils look for ways to improve the school.
2. Pupils sometimes do things to help.
3. Pupils will help when they are asked.
4. Pupils don't do things that are helpful.
5. Pupils find ways to harm the school.

H. How do your parents feel about your school?

1. My parents think this is an excellent school.
2. They think it is good: it gives me a good education.
3. My parents don't say much about the school.
4. They think it is just fair - not too good.
5. They are very critical of my school. They don't like it.

I. Do you think your parents are interested in the school?

1. My parents are keenly interested and frequently participate in school activities involving parents.
2. They sometimes attend Open House and/or P.T.A. or Mothers' Club.
3. They are indifferent. They don't care what happens.
4. They are really not interested. They come to school only if they are called by the principal.
5. They refuse to have anything to do with the school.

J. Do you feel that the students are allowed a part in planning school programs?

1. Pupils are allowed no say - the principal does it all.
2. Pupils are allowed some say - when the principal asks for their judgment.
3. The pupils are consulted by the principal on many school matters (problems).
4. The principal meets regularly with students to discuss plans.
5. The pupils plan projects with the approval of the principal.

K. What do you do about extra-curricular activities?

1. I am a leader and I take part in many activities.
2. I take part in some activities but I am not a leader.
3. I attend some activities (parties, games, etc.)
4. A "few students run everything" and I don't belong.
5. There aren't any outside activities in my school.

L. Why do some class rooms have more damage than others? That is more: carved desks, broken desks, broken equipment, etc.

1. Some class rooms have more damage because the classes are very large.
2. Some have more because of the subject taught (music,science,art,English,etc)
3. Some have more damage because of the kinds of pupils in those rooms.
4. Some have more because of the pupils' lack of interest in learning.
5. Some have more because the teacher doesn't make the subject interesting.
6. Some class rooms are damaged because of that teacher's attitude or lack of discipline.

M. What should happen if a pupil damages property in a school?

1. He should be made to repair the damage or to pay for it from his own money.
2. His parents should pay for the damage.
3. He should be punished by the school authorities.
4. He should be reported to the police.
5. The damage should be ignored - nothing should be done about it.

Why do pupils damage school property? For example: smash windows, mark up lavatories, carve desks, kick in lockers, break equipment, write on walls, etc. (Place a figure 1 in front of the most important reason, a 2 before the next, a 3 before the third most important, etc. Mark all five.)

N. _____ They damage things because they are bored with school.

O. _____ They do it to attract attention, to get recognition or "show off."

P. _____ They do it because their group or pals do it - to belong.

Q. _____ They do it because "there's nothing else to do."

R. _____ They damage school property for revenge - it's resentment against school, teachers, etc.

S. How do pupils feel about your principal?

1. They are afraid of him. He's too strict.
2. They respect him. He's always fair and just.
3. Almost everyone thinks he's wonderful - none better.
4. He's not strict enough - too easy-going.
5. The kids know they can get away with murder!

T. How do you feel about the counselors in your school?

1. Counselors are very helpful when students have troubles or problems.
2. Counselors are helpful in planning school schedules.
3. Counselors are only mildly interested in helping students.
4. Counselors act mainly as disciplinarians in our school: They punish pupils for misbehavior.
5. I don't know what the counselors do.

U. How strict are your teachers?

1. I think most of my teachers are much too strict.
2. I think they are just about right in strictness.
3. They are neither too strict nor too easy.
4. They are a little on the easy side.
5. I think they are much too lenient.

V. How do pupils behave when you have substitute teachers?

1. We act our best so as to give a good impression of our school.
2. We are cooperative and helpful to substitutes.
3. We act the same as with our regular teachers.
4. Since they are only substitutes, we pay little attention.
5. We give substitutes a hard time.

W. How do pupils feel about the custodian?

1. They feel that he is always a real friend looking for ways to help.
2. They feel that he is sometimes friendly and helpful.
3. They feel that he pays little or no attention to them.
4. They feel that he criticizes pupils and blames everything on them.
5. They feel that he is unfriendly and spies, bosses and is mean to them.

X. What is your father's job? What work does he do? Be specific - not just where he works, but what he does there.

Y. Does he own his shop, business or office?

Z. Do your parents own your home? (Encircle the answer)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

APPENDIX E

Outline for obtaining history of the school.

I. Neighborhood and Physical location.
   1. History of changes in neighborhood.
   2. Changes in school population.
   3. Parent-school relations (P.T.A. etc.).
   4. Families of students, socio-economic level.
   5. Area playground: use, lighting, upkeep, supervision, etc.
   6. Use of the school facilities by the community.

II. Building and Grounds
   1. When school first built.
   2. Additions to building and equipment.
   3. Room assignments: teacher identification and responsibility; teacher seniority in choice; floaters.
   4. Teachers' Common Rooms: smoking, lunch, restrooms, etc.
   5. Gym - its use in relation to school program.
   6. Library: when established, care of books, frequency of use, etc.
   7. School grounds - care of lawn, etc.

III. City School Administration and its policies.
   1. Zoning changes.
   2. School supplies and equipment.
   3. Assignment of teachers (teacher shifts - morale).
   4. Pupil transfers from other schools.
   5. Changes in grades and program of school (Jr., Sr. high; academic - vocational, etc.)

IV. School Staff - History and changes.
   1. Principal: who, when, how long, types of admin., policy, availability, success, etc.
   2. Vice-principal: responsibility, history, attitudes, kinds, relation to school spirit.
   3. Counselors.
   4. Teachers: turnover, teamwork, morale, changes in staff.
   5. Custodians.

V. Students

1. Student orientation
2. Student interest and cooperation.
3. Student council: history, functions, influence.
4. Extra-curricular activities: changes over the years, student participation, etc.
5. Student hangers-on and/or drop-outs.
6. Repeaters.
7. Attendance: absence-tardiness.
8. Alumni Group.
9. Study-hall policy.

VI. Curriculum: changes and development

1. Relation to community needs.
2. Work-school policy.
3. New programs, courses, etc.
4. Curriculum changes and emphases.

VII. Miscellaneous

1. Routines: passing in halls, supervision, responsibility.
2. Discipline techniques.
3. Promotions vs. time-servers.
4. Communications: orientation, assembly, unilateral?
5. Handbook for *students*.
6. Handbook for teachers.
7. Consistency of policy, growth, development.
8. Faculty participation in administrative decisions - Faculty meetings.
9. School "reputation", citywide.

APPENDIX F

Interpersonal Factors in the Disposition of Juvenile Offenders: Police and Janitors as Apprehenders. *

This was an exploratory investigation of the extent to which a sample of janitors and policemen differed in the ways in which they oriented toward the disposition of cases of malicious mischief. Past investigations have demonstrated the legitimacy of the differential disposition proposition. There are also reasons to suppose that the occupational role of the apprehender and the behavior of the offender are likely to constitute significant variables in the disposition of cases. Past studies have typically considered disposition as being of function of either selective characteristics of offenders or selective characteristics of apprehenders. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between both offender characteristics and apprehender characteristics in the process of differential disposition. The major assumption of the study was that the selective factors in the differential disposition of juvenile offenders could be found to be functions of relationships between offender attributes and apprehender phenomena within the context of limited interpersonal situations.

A consideration of the different work situations of police and janitors suggested a number of important questions relative to this study. This investigation, however, was designed to deal with just a few of the possible relevant issues: Does one set of functionaries tend to be more punitive than the other?; To what extent do the two functionaries tend to dispose of certain cases in essentially the same fashion?; To what extent do the two functionaries tend to dispose of cases in different ways?; To what extent do differences in role conceptions of the apprehenders influence differential disposition of cases? A major focus throughout all of the above questions was: To what extent does the interpersonal behavior of offenders tend to operate as an intervening variable in the process of disposition of cases?

---

* By William R. Rosengren. Summary of an unpublished Doctor of Social Science dissertation, Syracuse University, 1959.

Hypotheses and Method

Three main hypotheses were set forth as follows:

I. Some types of offender behaviors will elicit punitive responses from apprehenders regardless of differences in the occupational role of the apprehender.

II. Other types of offender behaviors will elicit selective responses from different role-categories of apprehenders. Police and janitors differentially treat offenders in terms of the different kinds of behaviors on the part of offenders toward which they react.

III. Differences in the disposition of offenders are related to differences in social characteristics of apprehenders.

The first hypothesis proposed that certain behavioral characteristics would tend to elicit common responses from both sets of functionaries. The second hypothesis proposed that certain other behavioral characteristics would tend to elicit different responses depending upon the occupational role of the apprehender. The third hypothesis proposed that differential reaction to certain behavioral characteristics of presumed offenders would be a function of differences in the ways in which apprehenders define their own role relative to juvenile offenders and differences in certain demographic attributes of apprehenders.

An array of sixteen behavioral characteristics was derived from Henry Murray's 'need-press' scheme. A generalized apprehension situation was designed for each behavioral quality. A sample of ten park policemen and ten public school janitors were interviewed with regard to their experiences with cases of property destruction by juveniles. They were then presented with each of the sixteen hypothetical apprehension situations and asked to indicate how they typically handled such offenders. Chi-square and Fisher's test were used as tests of significance.

It was found that both the janitors and the police tended to react in a punitive fashion toward the Aggressive type, and in a lenient fashion toward the Communicable, Blamavoiding, Narcissistic, and Succorant types. The police tended to react in a punitive fashion toward the Rejecting, Self-abasing, and Placid offender types. The janitors, on the other hand, tended to react in a lenient manner toward those types. Conversely, the janitors tended to react punitively toward the Autonomous, Narcissistic, Impulsive, and Emotional offender types. The policemen did not so react to those types.

Regarding total punitive responses to all offender types it was found that those functionaries, whether police or janitors, who seemed to be least concerned over the problem of juvenile delinquency tended to be more punitive than those who appeared more concerned over the problem. It was also found that the longer a functionary had been on the job, the less concerned he tended to be.

A consideration of the case data from the interviews suggested the following associations:

1. Janitors seemed to make clear distinctions between those acts which were 'their business' and those that were not; the police were more encompassing in their conceptions of relevant acts for them.

2. The janitors tended to view acts of destruction from the frame of reference of the acts' affect upon their status in the school system; the police were generally less personalized in their approach to cases.

3. Lenient reactions on the part of janitors appeared to be partially associated with the janitors' identification with the values of the offenders. Lenient reactions on the part of police appeared to be related to negative attitudes that the officers held toward the park system.

4. The janitors tended to have more disposition alternatives than did the police.

5. The selection of a course of action by the police tended to be dependent upon their judgment as to what course of action would be most effective either as 'punishment' or as 'rehabilitation.' The choice made by the janitors seemed to be more dependent upon their personal predelictions about a given case and the school in which they worked.

6. In instances in which the police indicated a preference to handle a case on their own initiative it appeared to be because they were not very concerned about such violations; the janitors who did this tended to indicate high concern.

7. In instances in which the police and janitors were critical of the system in which they worked, the police tended to discount the importance of the problem of delinquency, whereas the janitors tended to magnify the problem.

8. Risk factors favoring punishment tended to be increased in situations involving janitors who were critical of their school but decreased for policemen who were critical of the park system.

9. In instances in which an act of destruction was committed in a bizarre or dramatic fashion, the janitors were likely to respond with attitudes bordering on admiration; the police were more likely to view such acts as evidence of a 'professional modus operandi.'

10. The janitors tended to take a much more personalized approach to the attitude of the violator than did the police. The janitors were apparently more interested in the tractability of offenders.

11. A consideration of the responses that the police and janitors made to the sixteen hypothetical offender types suggested that the respondents were reacting less toward a logical analysis of the behavioral significance of the types as such, and more toward the imagery and meanings which they found in them. The facility with which the respondents interpreted the meanings of the sixteen types appeared to be related to the firmness of the cognitive hypotheses which they brought to bear upon the types. The firmness of the respondents' cognitive hypothesis seemed to be at least partially contingent upon their integration with their work organizations.

12. The police officers seemed to be less inclined than were the janitors to define the seriousness of offenses in terms of specific kinds of acts.

13. Janitors who seemed least sure of their own role expectations relative to such offenses appeared to be the most punitive of the janitor group. There was no

clear pattern for the police in this regard.

14. Generally speaking, the less clear a janitor was about the official policy under which he was presumably operating, the more punitive he tended to be. The less clear an officer was about the official policy under which he operated, the less punitive he tended to be.

It would seem that the above considerations of data permit one to speak of 'interpersonal risk factors', in at least one form of delinquent behavior, to the extent that the likelihood of an offender's eliciting a punitive response from an apprehender appears to be dependent upon the offender's behavioral qualities, the occupational role of the apprehender, and the complexities of the apprehender's individual work situation as a transactional process.

There are a number of important weaknesses in this study. First, the sample is very small—just ten janitors and ten police officers. There is no suggestion here that the patterns found are characteristic of all such functionaries.

Secondly, the respondents were reacting to hypothetical situations. In spite of efforts to make the cases as realistic as possible, there is no surety that this was achieved. In all such techniques, one can seldom be sure that he is receiving responses in terms of what the respondents have actually done in the past, what they think they will do in the future, or what they think the investigator wants them to say.

Within the limits of the methodology employed, the following tentative conclusions were drawn: (1) different types of offender behaviors tend to elicit different responses from apprehenders, (2) other types of offender behaviors tend to elicit differential responses from different role categories of apprehenders, and (3) selective factors in the disposition of juvenile offenders appear to be a function of transactions which take place between offenders and apprehenders as an interpersonal process, (4) the orientation that an apprehender took toward juvenile offenders was related to his conception of his own role, and (5) the orientation that an apprehender took toward juvenile offenders was related to the kinds and extent of integration he had with his own work milieu.

APPENDIX G

A Survey of Vandalism and Its Cultural Antecedants on Four New York State Indian Reservations. *

The purpose of this study was to obtain some understanding of the problem of the destruction of public property as it occurs on four New York State Indian reservations. This would provide us with information on such behavior in a non Euro-American culture geographically contained within American society. On the reservations studied, morever, distinctions are drawn between tribal property and property of the State or other white organizations. In the light of the long history of conflict between Indians and the State a consideration of acts of vandalism directed against State or other white-owned property might afford us with some hypotheses regarding the nature of the act of property destruction.

The four reservations studied were: Cattaraugus, St. Regis, Tonawanda, and Onondaga. The investigator became familiar with the history and culture of each of the reservations, from the research literature, prior to engaging in the field observations. A sample of reservation school personnel and reservation residents were interviewed, as well as civil authorities, farmers, shopkeepers, etc., in neighboring areas. Approximately 30 informants were formally interviewed in the course of the research. Added weight was given to the evidence supplied by these informants by informal conversations held with a number of other persons.

In the formal and informal interviews, information was sought on the following topics: instances of vandalism, functions and status of public or communal buildings, the background of children known to be involved in acts of vandalism, the attitudes of reservation residents toward public or communal buildings, the level of reservation morale, social organization on the reservation, the general socio-economic status of the residents, attitudes toward property, and attitudes toward the behavior of youth.

Data from the four reservations seem to indicate that the attitudes of parents and community toward the state or tribal facilities on the reservation is a significant factor in acts of vandalism by children. Goldman (1) suggests a close correspondence between the incidence of vandalism and the general attitude or "morale" of students and school personnel with respect to the school and

---

* By Carol A. Fisher. A summary of an unpublished Doctor of Social Science dissertation, Syracuse University, 1959.

administration. Certainly the St. Regis reservation data demonstrate this same correspondence, showing incidents of vandalism that occur at a time of tension and upset in the school. But, in addition to this factor of morale within a school, the data from the Indian reservations indicate that attitudes within the community as a whole and of parents of school-age children specifically, with respect to a given public facility, may have a direct relation to vandalism.

It was indicated by informants from the St. Regis reservation that school problems were a continual subject of discussion in the homes of school-age children during a period of vandalism against the school, and that many parents expressed contempt for the principal, the teachers, and the curriculum, and also the State for burdening them with such a school system. These criticisms were made in front of children who were, at the same time, being scolded for their backwardness in reading and writing. St. Regis informants stated further that in discussing school vandalism,parents were known to have said in fromt of their children "They (School personnel and/or the State) deserve it. What are they doing for us?"

These data suggest the possible operation of several factors. Scoldings from parents for inadequate performance in school or for inadequate learning may well result in frustration and aggression directed toward the punishing parents. Direct aggression against the frustrating parents would result in punishment or the withdrawal of love; but, to displace the aggression against the school would not appear to carry these threats since the parents themselves have criticized the school for its failures with the children (2). Hearing his parents condone acts of vandalism against the school would tend to reduce the St. Regis Indian child s anticipation of punishment from parents. Parental criticism of the school would further serve to channel aggression against the school.

Another interpretation of these data is in terms of general community attitude or morale. The outbreaks of window-breaking on the St. Regis reservation were seen to correspond with high community resentment against the school administration. The absence of damage to the inside of the St. Regis school during these periods of community disturbance tends to confirm the significance of parental and community attitudes in the control of vandalism by children, since many members of the community had participated in the decoration of the interior of the school and expressed the conviction during the times of tension that these Indian decorations were the only good thing about the school.

Further corroborative data are provided by the materials from the Onondaga reservation where an attack against the Episcopal manse occured at a time of community displeasure with the minister. Since not everyone on the Onondaga reservation uses the N.Y.A. Community Building, and since Longhouse members tend to regard it as a relatively unimportant part of reservation life, the threat of punishment for damage is lowered and damage is increased. Tentative materials from the Tonawanda indicate that the Community Building there is held in high regard and is used by both Longhouse and Christian members. There was no indication of vandalism against this building.

These materials from the Indian reservations have significance beyond the mere reflection of parental and community attitudes in the aggressive behavior of children towards unpopular persons or institutions, for property destruction as an expression of personal conflict appears in some measure to be founded upon Iroquois cultural tradition. Revenge for personal insult or grievance may be expressed through property destruction. Occasionally family feuds take such form. Elders on the Onondaga reservation today wag their heads over what they refer to as a "coincidence" in the past between a barn burning and "cutting down" the chief who owned the barn. However, they comment that "He should have been warned and mended his ways when his barn burned down."

Adult attitudes toward the vandalism against the St. Regis school and Onondaga Episcopal church were reflected in such comments as "What else would you expect?" and "They deserved it." Thus the act of vandalism appears to be generally accepted by the Indian community. Adult comments about children involved in other problems such as joy-riding, petty stealing, breaking into small stores, drunken and rowdy behavior reflect a very different attitude. Often these were, "They associate with the wrong people", "They learn these ways in town where we have no control over them," and "They re bad boys. No one can do anything with them." It appears that vandalism directed against unpopular white officials or service facilities is not generally viewed by the adult Indians as a juvenile offense or "juvenile delinquency" as are other juvenile conduct problems, but instead as a part of the Indian tradition, representing an acceptable form of expression of community antagonism. Note that the Indian community lacks a means of taking action against the administration of unpopular white agencies that would be approved by the larger white community. In the past the Office of Indian Affairs has administered health, education and welfare facilities on the reservations. Today the administration of education has been removed from the Office of Indian Affairs but still remains divorced from Indian control through the property tax qualifications for voting in school board elections. Even control over mission churches is somewhat removed from Indian influence since outside missions funds can support an unpopular church.

In the light of the general Indian attitude of antagonism and hostility toward white persons, it would be natural to expect a far greater amount of culturally supported vandalism than actually appears to be the case. The data suggest the operation of three factors that tend to restrict the amount of such vandalism: The fear of shaming family and community, the influence of strong white personalities at the head of State services, and the Indians' concept of ownership.

The Fear of Shame. Informants on three reservations, the Onondaga, St. Regis and Cattaraugus, volunteered opinions that the shyness of Indian children is a factor in a low incidence of vandalism. This reported shyness is with reference to contact with strangers, especially whites. The shyness may be a part of the general Indian suspicion of white people and especially of the activities of the State with reference to them. I was warned on several occasions that any mention of the fact that my study was in part supported by funds granted by the U. S. Office of Education to Syracuse University would immediately prejudice the Indians against the research. Wallace's study of the Tuscarora modal personality demonstrates this same Indian suspicion of the motives of all whites (3). The children share in the Indian community desire to have as little as possible to do with whites and to be left alone to handle their own affairs. Community shame is attached to any action that results in the intrusion of "white law" into reservation affairs. The reported shyness in Indian children may be a reflection of this desire to avoid behavior that would invite white interference. The personnel of public facilities on the reservations - schools, health centers, and mission churches - are for the most part white. The facilities are controlled by the State, and destructive behavior against these facilities most certainly invites white intrusion on the reservations. Socialization practices among the Onondaga involve the use of fear of shame as a means of behavior control; it is entirely possible that the fear of bringing shame to the parents and to the community by acts of violence against public facilities manned by white personnel and privately owned white property may inhibit vandalism. It may be that as the attitude of the Indian community toward the public facility worsens, fear of community shame becomes correspondingly less important as a factor in restraining vandalism.

The reluctance to bring outsiders into the affairs of the Indian provides an important source of influence for the reservation chiefs. Even with the passage of the 1948 and 1950 jurisdiction laws, public officials still make referrals to the chiefs or authorities on the reservation rather than risk the displeasure of reservation residents by acting directly in accordance with State law. The To-do-da-ho reported that when cases of juvenile offenders are referred to the chiefs, they speak to the parents and "warn them that if they don't keep their boy out of trouble we won't help them if it happens again." The chiefs thus are in a position to shame parents by refusing to intercede for them, permitting public authorities to turn over a child to the "white" courts.

White Leadership. Most State-owned buildings on Indian reservations exist for specific educational or welfare services and are directed in large part by white personnel. Historical materials demonstrate the significant influence of unusually strong white leader on the early Iroquois. Data from the reservations indicate that today the personalities involved in such institutions are significant factors in the amount of vandalism directed against their property.

The principal of the Cattaraugus school is universally respected; there is no record of vandalism against the school. The principal of the Onondaga reservation school is also deeply respected and although the curriculum and individual teachers are sometimes criticized, residents blame the State rather than the principal for these. On the St. Regis reservation, a school principal was disliked personally and was held directly responsible for curriculum problems and all other difficulties associated with the school. During his administration there was vandalism at the St. Regis school. Although his successor has done some things to displease reservation residents they withhold judgment on him personally as result of his organization of desirable curriculum changes. But they make it clear that they are not yet convinced one way or another. A further illustration is provided by the vandalism against the N.Y.A. building on the Onondaga reservation. Although there has been some reservation feeling against the health clinic, the nurse was highly respected by reservation residents. The boys who damaged the Community building in thich the clinic is housed did not at any time enter or disturb the clinic.

Vandalism on reservations was seldom directed against facilities supervised by persons respected by the Indians. A well liked person at the head of a public agency might serve to reduce community displeasure at curriculum changes or the use of the facility after hours and the like. A disliked official is frequently held personally responsible for aspects of the service that are disapproved by the community. Thus an unusual white person at the head of a State agency can win loyalty to the facility despite the customary Indian attitude of hostility.

Concepts of Ownership. Damage to abandoned school buildings on the Cattaraugus reservation illustrates the simple principle that mere ownership, regardless of occupancy serves as a check against vandalism among these Indians. That this is apparently not a pattern common to all of the reservations visited is evidenced by the Onondaga vandalism against vacant houses with established ownership.

Reservation people generally show respect for property. Destruction of private property as a means of revenge serves to illustrate this high regard for the importance of private property. It is to be expected then that on a reservation such as the Cattaraugus where instances of vandalism are almost unknown, deliberate damage to vacant property owned by private individuals would be minimal. However, in view of the fact that the State is so universally suspect on all the reservations, a property ownership decision in favor of the State might make the building a target for vandalism. Such damage is likely to occur because of community resentment of the decision, or because the State would not seem to 'own' property in the sense that a private individual would and thus the building would seem to be both vacant and unowned.

In the history of the Iroquois we may see the basis for this behavior. Children learn early of the land transactions between government and Indians and usually identify these transactions as overt acts of theft on the part of the State. The Federal and State governments acquired Indian land through a series of treaties, and thereby displaced the Indian as owner of the land. Furthermore, in Iroquois tradision, it was not the individual Indian who had proprietory rights to the land but the Nation and the Six Nations. Part of contemporary Iroquois culture involves a continuing contest over actual ownership of these lands. One may postulate, therefore, that there exists a fundamental difference in notions of ownership of public property between the Indian child and the white child. (4)

Studies by Eberhart, Durea, and Powers and Witmer on the relationship between attitudes toward property and juvenile delinquency although not devoted directly to the problem of public or private property ownership do indicate that offenses against public property are generally ranked lowest in a scale of seriousness by white children. (5) Eberhart concludes:

> "Judgments of the seriousness of property offenses seem to be based principally upon the relationship of the owner to the offender...the kind of property involved and the value of the property". (6)

It is with respect to these aspects of property that there appears to be a difference between the property attitudes of white and Indian children.

The Indian s membership in a particular Nation or tribe is a personal relationship that serves to define his role in the community with reference to persons from other reservations, and also as an initial point of self-identification. It is not enough to be identified merely as an Indian (or even to reject this identification), for in Iroquois life tribe and clan affiliations are significant status and behavior determinants. The Indian child learns to look to the "nation" for the security of tribal lands, and even that of the very house in which he lives, rather than to his parents. Thus the notion of ownership by an abstract collection of people a nation or tribe, is a fundamental aspect of the child's learning and it is to the tribe or nation that he looks for the good things of life. From the State, as real an entity as the tribe by its very juxtaposition to the tribe, he expects the bad things in his life. It would seem that the process of socialization in a white child would not involve this early development of the notion of property ownership by an abstract power nor the development of a conception of polar abstracts symbolizing good and bad respectively.

These ideas based on limited evidence can be considered only as speculative. However, by showing the early development in the life of the Indian child of a specific concept of the ownership of property by an abstract group, they would seem to account in part at least for the cessation of vandalism against the abandoned school buildings on the Cattaraugus reservation when buildings were awarded to individuals as well as when they were awarded to the State. By reifying the State and equating state ownership with proprietorship by a private individual, the destruction of state property may be viewed as falling within the general reservation pattern of destruction of private property for revenge, or 'to get even' as well as within the pattern of expression of community resentment. That such damage against the Cattaraugus school building after it was awarded to the State did not occur might be a reflection of the possibility that the revenge-destruction pattern is not an important part of the cultural behavior on the Cattaraugus reservation. It was also reported, but not adequately confirmed, that community resentment was not very strong against the settlement in favor of the State. Low community resentment, coupled with a desire not to have trouble with the whites, and the weakness of revenge patterns on the Cattaraugus might operate to reduce the possibility for vandalism after the settlement was made in favor of the State.

Destruction of Private Property. There was no evidence from the survey data that Indian children have been accused of, or involved in vandalism against private property owned by white persons on or off the reservation. Conversely there is no evidence of white children attacking Indian property. On the Onondaga reservation the adult Indians occasionally complained of adult whites trespassing in the area of the quarry and expressed the opinion that whites occasionally stole from the quarry. On the St. Regis reservation the white owners of a filling station and a lunch counter complained that Indian young people had been destructive on the two occasions when they broke into these places and stole money and cigarettes. In both cases, however, the destruction was directly connected with forced entry and did not fit a pattern of destruction for its own sake.

There is really little opportunity for white children to commit vandalism against Indian property since there are few white children on the reservations. On the other hand, Indian young people on the St. Regis and Onondaga reservations have considerable opportunity to visit the adjoining white communities for jobs, recreation, and for education. However, the data indicate that the offenses committed by Indian young people who do get into trouble in the white communities are most often petty stealing, joy-riding, and drunken and disorderly conduct rather than vandalism. Even abandoned buildings, private or public, off the reservations do not appear to suffer at the hands of Indian youth although it is perfectly clear that privately owned but vacant buildings on the St. Regis and Onondaga reservations constitute targets for vandalism that is somewhat condoned by adults, and that destruction of private property is a proper mode of revenge for grievance.

An obvious restraint to vandalism against privately owned white property is that whereas difficulties of this sort on the reservation might involve the intrusion of white authorities, such difficulties off the reservation most certainly would. Furthermore Indian young people are apt to be shy with whites and there would be little opportunity to develop the personal relationship which appears to be a part of the revenge pattern. Thus the incidence of acts of vandalism by Indian youth in white communities is minimized.

Two Concepts of Vandalism. In conclusion, the data seem to offer evidence that there are two distinct patterns of vandalism among the Indians studied. The first is a pattern of behavior based on Indian tradition and condoned by adult Indians. The second pattern of vandalism is in imitation of 'white' vandalism and delinquency and does not meet with adult Indian approval. Acts of destruction by Indian youth that represent an expression of personal or community antagonism, although in violation of the law, cannot be equated with white vandalism or delinquency, since they fall within Indian tradition. Random acts of destruction, the formation of 'gangs', petty stealing and joy-riding are not within Indian tradition; such acts are not only condemned by the Indian community but are universally blamed upon learnings from "white" tradition. Hence, they may be more properly considered as acts of delinquency.

Summary. We have been able to determine, through our consideration of the four reservations, some characteristics of vandalism in a non Euro-American culture. The data indicate some interesting relations between the pattern of vandalism and the cultural history of the group. Since this information is based on a limited sample of the Indian population, and since only limited checks on the reliability of the information were available, these findings are offered only as a first order approach to the problem. With these limitations in mind, the following conclusions are presented:

1. Acts of destruction, among Indians, appear to represent culturally patterned expressions of personal and community conflicts.
2. Fear of personal and community shame appears to act as a deterrent to acts of property destruction.
3. The presence of a strong and a respected individual at the head of a public agency may serve to mitigate the conventional Indian expressions of hostility toward the State.
4. There seem to be differences in conceptions of property ownership among white and Indian children, associated with attitudes toward property destruction.
5. On Indian reservations there seem to emerge two distinct patterns of destructive behavior by children. One is culturally determined and approved by adults; the other, is likened to delinquent conduct among white children, and is condemned by adults.

Footnotes

(1) Goldman, Nathan. "Attitudes Toward Vandalism". Unpublished paper, delivered at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in Seattle, Washington, 29 August 1958.

(2) For the relationship between frustration and aggression see Dollard, J., L. Doob, et. al., Frustration and Aggression, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. For a discussion of this hypothesis see Krech, David, and Richard S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948. Studies by Goldman (personal communication) and by Eberhard, John C., "Attitudes Toward Property". A Genetic Study by the Paired-Comparisons Rating of Offenses," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1942, 60, 3-35, indicate that fear of parental punishment is an important factor in restraining juvenile misbehavior in Euro-American society.

(3) Wallace, Anthony F. C., "The Modal Personality Structure of the Tuscarora Indians As Revealed by the Rorschach Test". Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Athnology, Bulletin 150, Washington D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952, 1-120.

(4) See Snyderman, George S., "Concepts of Land Ownership Among the Iroquois and Their Neighbors", in Symposium on Local Diversity in Iroquois Culture, Smithsonian Institution, Bulletin 149, Washington D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951, for historical and contemporary adult Indian concepts of land.

(5) Eberhart, op. cit.; Durea, Mervin A., "An Experimental Study of Attitudes Toward Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1933, 17, 522-534; Durea, Mervin A., "A Survey of the Extent and Nature of Offenses Committed by Delinquent Boys," Journal of Juvenile Research, 1935, 19, 62-74; and Powers, Edwin and Helen Witmer, An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency: The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, New York, Columbia University Press, 1951.

(6) Eberhart, op. cit., pp. 33-34.